

ST. CROIX RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we begin with calendar No. 1049, where we left off yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks that the Senate take up the calendar under Rule VIII, beginning with calendar No. 1049. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (H. R. 31860) permitting the building of a wagon and trolley car bridge across the St. Croix River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOBILE RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (H. R. 31538) to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NEW RIVER DAM, VIRGINIA.

The bill (H. R. 31922) to authorize the Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Co. to build a dam across the New River, near Foster Falls, Wythe County, Va., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. BORAH. As the Senator from Texas has given notice that he desires to address the Senate to-day on the election case, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate Report No. 942. Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections relative to certain charges relating to the election of WILLIAM LORIMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois, by the Legislature of that State.

Mr. BAILEY addressed the Senate. After having spoken, with interruptions, for 2 hours and 45 minutes,

Mr. CARTER. I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas be permitted to continue his remarks immediately at the close of morning business to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas be permitted to resume his remarks immediately after the routine morning business to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. BURTON. I do not rise to object to the request. I gave notice on the 8th that I would address the Senate immediately after the close of the morning business to-morrow, and the pending request, if granted, would displace me at that time. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, however, if he would consent to change the date on which a vote is to be taken on the forest-reserve bill?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let it be the next day.

Mr. BURTON. The date is fixed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not understand that that can be done.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; it can.

Mr. BURTON. By unanimous consent, it seems to me, it can be done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; it can not. We can not change a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. GALLINGER. You can not change a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LODGE. You can not change a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] has given notice for Wednesday.

Mr. CARTER. Is there any objection? I inquire if any objection has been made to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BURTON. I do not feel that in any event I shall make objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BACON. We can not hear what the request is.

Mr. CARTER. The request is that immediately following the close of morning business to-morrow the Senator from Texas be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. BACON. Of course, I have no objection whatever to that request. I simply want to know whether that will conflict with any previous unanimous consent. It is most important.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that it does. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears no objection.

[For Mr. BAILEY's entire speech see Senate proceedings of Tuesday, February 14.]

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 13, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Dr. John Wesley Hill, pastor of Metropolitan Temple, New York City, delivered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest in the light, under whom all things come in their ripeness and fullness, Thou unto whom all things come in ever-increasing perfection, we rejoice that Thou art waiting to receive our worship. We bless Thee that upon us Thy knowledge has dawned; that about us Thy providence is engaged in our behalf; and that before us are the rewards of Thy righteousness, which exalteth men and nations. Commend Thy blessing upon us at this hour; bless this body assembled; grant that its deliberations may be inspired with patriotism and seasoned with wisdom and crowned with Thy favor. Bless, we pray Thee, the President of the United States; bless his constitutional advisers; bless all judges and lawmakers; bless all those upon whom devolve official responsibility; bless our land and Nation. Save us from vice and violence, from restlessness and revolution, and from evil. Open the way before us and lead us out into that large field of opportunity and influence and power which Thou hast set before us in the hour of Thy providence. Send out Thy light and Thy truth everywhere. Hasten the day when peace shall be enthroned among the nations of the earth and when Thy kingdom shall be established from the river unto the sea. And unto Thee will we ascribe the praise and the glory forever, through Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOHN R. KISSINGER.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. PRINCE. I rise to make a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRINCE. I move that the House agree to the conference report on the bill (S. 7252) for the relief of John R. Kissinger, and ask that the conference report be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.

The conference report was read.

[For conference report and statement, see House proceedings in the Record of February 11, 1911.]

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] rise?

Mr. McCALL. I rise to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the bill H. R. 32216, which is the bill relating to reciprocity with Canada.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] rise?

Mr. OLCOTT. I make the point of order that this is a day set apart for District of Columbia business.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. DWIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Allen	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager	Roberts
Andrus	Gill, Md.	McCredie	Roddenbery
Barchfeld	Gill, Mo.	McGuire, Okla.	Sabbath
Barclay	Gordon	McHenry	Simmons
Bates	Hamilton	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Cal.
Bennett, Ky.	Hardwick	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Mich.
Capron	Haugen	McMorran	Sperry
Cocks, N. Y.	Hobson	Millington	Spight
Cole	Howard	Moore, Tex.	Stevens, Minn.
Cooper, Wis.	Hubbard, W. Va.	Morehead	Sturgiss
Coudrey	Huff	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Cravens	Huges, W. Va.	Murdock	Thomas, Ohio
Creager	Joyce	Parker	Townsend
Diekema	Kahn	Patterson	Vreeland
Driscoll, M. E.	Kinkead, N. J.	Payne	Wallace
Edwards, Ga.	Lamb	Ransdell, La.	Wheeler
Fairchild	Lenroot	Reeder	Wilson, Pa.
Foelker	Lindsay	Rhinoek	Wood, N. J.
Fowler	Loud	Riordan	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and four Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. DWIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. OLCOTT rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. OLCOTT. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York rises to make a parliamentary inquiry. He will state it.

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask whether it will be in order for me to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of business relating to the District of Columbia, this being the day set apart by the rules for the consideration of such matters.

The SPEAKER. This is the day under the rules for the consideration of District business, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] makes a motion that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a revenue bill. This is a matter of privilege, and the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] for the preservation of the day set apart for the transaction of District business is also a matter of privilege. A majority can determine which business the House will proceed to by voting down the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, if a majority sees proper so to do, in which event the Chair would recognize the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I make a further point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia will state it.

Mr. GAINES. At the time that the Speaker recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] was on his feet also demanding recognition. I make the point of order that upon the day specially set aside for a particular kind of business the Chair should first recognize to make a privileged motion that gentleman who has charge of the District business.

The SPEAKER. And yet, according to the parliamentary theory, at least, a general appropriation bill or a revenue bill, one proposing to raise money in theory and the other to spend money in theory, takes precedence, under the uniform practice of the House, of District day. Under the uniform practice a revenue bill has taken precedence in priority of recognition, and the Chair follows at least the theory, if not the substance, of the parliamentary rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, might I ask if it would be possible to arrive at an agreement as to the time for debate or as to the control of debate if we should go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

The SPEAKER. That is not the question. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which is in order.

Mr. MANN. Pending that, it is always proper to ask for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly. The Chair will state that the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] is that the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with Canada, and so forth.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest—

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] having made the motion, and the motion being pending, either the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in the ordinary practice, pending that motion, could make such arrangements as might be agreed upon.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] suggests to me that after the vote is taken, if it be to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, before it is announced, we then make an attempt to get an agreement. Would it now be proper to ask unanimous consent to do that at that time?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this suggestion: Why can it not be arranged that the time for debate should be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we ought to postpone the making of our agreement about time until the House has determined what it is going to do.

Mr. MANN. It is only as to the control of the time in general debate.

The SPEAKER. The clerk at the desk calls the attention of the Chair to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] made a point of order, which the Chair overlooked, treating it as a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. OLCOTT. I do not. I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order again.

Mr. OLCOTT. The point of order is that this day being set apart for the work of the District of Columbia Committee, that is a matter of higher privilege than the matter brought before the House by the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAINES. Is it in order to move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of another privileged bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair's recollection of the practice of the House is that this motion is not amendable, because the question can be decided with no greater delay, and probably less delay, by the House voting directly upon the motion.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair will permit, the rule which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] probably has in mind is where a motion is made to go into Committee of the Whole after the House has been under call of the committees for one hour, when that motion is amendable by substituting one other bill; but that does not apply to this case.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Under the rule this is District day. Now, if we set that aside, will it not be necessary to suspend the rule, and will not that require a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, answering the parliamentary inquiry, a motion to suspend the rules is not in order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is not the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, in effect, a motion to suspend the rules, the rule requiring that District business should be considered to-day?

The SPEAKER. It is not, because while both motions are in order and privileged, the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] takes priority of recognition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for unanimous consent that, if the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on this bill, the time for general debate be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

McCALL] and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the time to be consumed in general debate be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. GAINES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the House proposes to go ahead with District day it would be much better not to make the arrangement now; whereas if the House determines to go ahead to-day with this bill, then I suggest that the gentleman modify his request and ask unanimous consent, if the House determines to go ahead with the reciprocity bill to-day, that after the vote has been taken, the question then be settled as to the control of time.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that is within the power of the House—

Mr. OLCOTT. I object, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker. The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 120, answered "present" 3, not voting 64, as follows:

YEAS—197.

Adair	Dies	Jamieson	Rainey
Adamson	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Randell, Tex.
Alexander, N. Y.	Douglas	Johnson, S. C.	Rauch
Ames	Draper	Jones	Reeder
Anderson	Driscoll, D. A.	Kelher	Reid
Ansberry	Durey	Kitchin	Richardson
Anthony	Edwards, Ga.	Knowland	Roberts
Ashbrook	Ferris	Korbly	Robinson
Barchfeld	Finley	Kronmiller	Roddenbery
Barnhart	Fish	Küstermann	Rucker, Colo.
Bartholdt	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Rucker, Mo.
Bartlett, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Latta	Saunders
Bartlett, Nev.	Floyd, Ark.	Law	Shackleford
Beall, Tex.	Fornes	Lawrence	Sharp
Bell, Ga.	Foss	Lee	Sheffield
Boehne	Foster, Ill.	Lever	Sheppard
Booher	Gallagher	Lively	Sherley
Boutell	Garner, Pa.	Livingston	Sherwood
Bowers	Garrett	Lloyd	Sims
Brantley	Gillespie	Longworth	Sisson
Burgess	Gillett	McCall	Slayden
Burke, Pa.	Glass	McCreary	Small
Burleson	Goldfogle	McDermott	Smith, Iowa
Burnett	Graff	McKinney	Smith, Tex.
Butler	Graham, Ill.	Macon	Sparkman
Byrd	Greene	Madden	Spight
Byrns	Gregg	Madison	Stafford
Calder	Hamer	Maguire, Nebr.	Stanley
Candler	Hamill	Mann	Stephens, Tex.
Cantrill	Hamlin	Martin, Colo.	Stevens, Minn.
Carter	Hardy	Maynard	Sulzer
Cassidy	Harrison	Mays	Tawney
Clark, Mo.	Havens	Miller, Kans.	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Hay	Mitchell	Thomas, Ky.
Cline	Heald	Moon, Pa.	Thomas, N. C.
Collier	Heflin	Moon, Tenn.	Tilson
Conry	Helm	Morrison	Tou Velle
Cooper, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Morse	Turnbull
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Tex.	Moss	Underwood
Cox, Ind.	Higgins	Needham	Washburn
Cox, Ohio	Hill	Nicholls	Watkins
Craig	Hinshaw	Nye	Weeks
Cravens	Hitchcock	O'Connell	Weisse
Crumpacker	Houston	Oldfield	Wickliffe
Cullop	Howland	Olmsted	Willett
Denby	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer, A. M.	Wilson, Ill.
Dent	Hughes, N. J.	Palmer, H. W.	Young, Mich.
Denver	Hull, Tenn.	Parsons	
Dickinson	Humphreys, Miss.	Peters	
Dickson, Miss.	James	Polindexter	

NAYS—120.

Alken	Dodds	Guernsey	Lundin
Alexander, Mo.	Dupre	Hammond	McGuire, Okla.
Austin	Dwight	Hanna	McLachlan, Cal.
Barnard	Ellerbe	Haugen	McLaughlin, Mich.
Bennet, N. Y.	Ellis	Hawley	McAlay
Bingham	Elvins	Hayes	Martin, S. Dak.
Borland	Englebright	Hollingsworth	Massey
Bradley	Esch	Howell, Utah	Miller, Minn.
Broussard	Estopinal	Hubbard, Iowa	Mondell
Burke, S. Dak.	Fassett	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Pa.
Burleigh	Focht	Humphrey, Wash.	Morgan, Mo.
Calderhead	Fordney	Johnson, Ohio	Morgan, Okla.
Campbell	Foster, Vt.	Kelfer	Moxley
Carlin	Fuller	Kendall	Murphy
Cary	Gaines	Kennedy, Iowa	Nelson
Chapman	Gardner, Mass.	Kennedy, Ohio	Norris
Clark, Fla.	Gardner, N. J.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Olcott
Cole	Garner, Tex.	Knapp	Page
Cowles	Godwin	Kopp	Pearre
Crow	Goebel	Lafean	Pickett
Currier	Good	Langham	Plumley
Dalzell	Goulden	Langley	Pou
Davidson	Graham, Pa.	Legare	Pratt
Davis	Grant	Lindbergh	Pray
Dawson	Griest	Lowden	Prince

Pujo	Slemp	Sulloway	Wanger
Rodenberg	Snapp	Swasey	Webb
Rothermel	Southwick	Thistlewood	Wiley
Scott	Steenerson	Thomas, Ohio	Woods, Iowa
Simmons	Sterling	Volstead	Young, N. Y.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.
Howell, N. J. Kinkead, N. J. Padgett

NOT VOTING—64.

Allen	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager	Riordan
Andrus	Gill, Md.	McCredie	Sabath
Barclay	Gill, Mo.	McHenry	Smith, Cal.
Bates	Gordon	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Mich.
Bennett, Ky.	Hamilton	McKinley, Ill.	Sperry
Capron	Hardwick	McMorran	Sturgiss
Cocks, N. Y.	Hobson	Millington	Talbott
Coudrey	Howard	Moore, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Hubbard, W. Va.	Morehead	Taylor, Ohio
Creager	Huff	Mudd	Townsend
Diekema	Hughes, W. Va.	Murdock	Vreeland
Driscoll, M. E.	Joyce	Parker	Wallace
Edwards, Ky.	Kahn	Patterson	Wheeler
Fairchild	Lenroot	Payne	Wilson, Pa.
Foelker	Lindsay	Ransdell, La.	Wood, N. J.
Fowler	Loud	Rhinock	Woodyard

So the motion was agreed to. The following pairs were announced: For the session: Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN. Until further notice: Mr. SPERRY with Mr. WALLACE. Mr. MURDOCK with Mr. RHINOCK. Mr. FOELKER with Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. MOORE of Texas. Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. HOBSON. Mr. BATES with Mr. GILL of Maryland. Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. KAHN with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. GORDON. Mr. PAYNE with Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. SMITH of California with Mr. HOWARD. Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. WOOD of New Jersey with Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. JOYCE with Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana, from February 10 to February 18, inclusive. Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia with Mr. SABATH, from February 10 to February 20, inclusive. Mr. LOUD with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, commencing February 13, noon, to February 15, noon. Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. GILL of Missouri, commencing February 10, noon, to February 16, noon. On Canadian reciprocity: Mr. MCKINLAY of California (in favor) with Mr. LENROOT (against). Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL (in favor) with Mr. ALLEN (against). Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey (in favor) with Mr. McMOHRAN (against). Mr. DIEKEMA with Mr. PADGETT, commencing to-day until further notice, on all questions except Canadian reciprocity. The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MANN in the chair. The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 32216, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to first recognize the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, a protective-tariff policy presupposes reciprocity and trade agreements. A free-trade policy has nothing to give in return for concessions, and hence nothing to gain from them.

Since the Republican Party was organized and while it has been in power there never has been a time but that reciprocal agreements with other countries have been in operation, and President Taft stands to-day in full harmony with Lincoln, Grant, McKinley, Roosevelt, and all of his illustrious predecessors with regard to that principle.

Under reciprocity trade between Hawaii and this country flourished to the great advantage of both, until by the logic of events the islands became a part of this Nation.

Under reciprocity our trade with Cuba has more than doubled, as follows:

Imports from Cuba to the United States for the year ending June 30, 1903-----	\$62,942,790
Exports from the United States to Cuba, same year-----	21,761,638
Total trade for the year 1903, before the treaty--	84,704,428
Imports from Cuba to the United States for the year ending June 30, 1910-----	122,528,037
Exports from the United States to Cuba, same year-----	52,858,758
Total trade for the year 1910, since the treaty----	175,386,795

Under free trade with Porto Rico, which met with a storm of denunciation when first proposed, but which William McKinley declared to be our "plain duty," our trade with that island has increased nearly fifteenfold, as shown by the following statement:

Exports from the United States to Porto Rico during the year ending June 30, 1898-----	\$1,505,946
Imports from Porto Rico to the United States, same year--	2,414,356
Total trade for the year ending June 30, 1898----	3,920,302
Shipments of merchandise from the United States to Porto Rico during the year ending June 30, 1910-----	27,097,654
Shipments of merchandise from Porto Rico to the United States, same year-----	32,095,897
Total trade for the year ending June 30, 1910----	59,193,551

Under reciprocal relations with the Philippine Islands, a territory containing a larger population than the Dominion of Canada, our mutual trade has grown in less than a single year 70 per cent, as shown by the following statement:

Exports from the United States to the Philippine Islands during the year ending June 30, 1909-----	\$11,189,441
Imports from the Philippine Islands to the United States, same year-----	9,433,986
Total trade for the year 1909, before free trade----	20,623,427
Exports from the United States to the Philippine Islands during the year ending June 30, 1910-----	16,832,645
Imports from the Philippine Islands to the United States, same year-----	17,317,897
Total trade for the year 1910, after free trade----	34,150,542

In every one of these cases the proposition to enter upon such trade relations was met with prophecies of dire disaster to some existing industry in our own country.

In every case the prophecy has failed of fulfillment, and the new policy has resulted in mutual advantage to both parties. It is true that in the cases which I have named some of the products have been tropical and noncompeting, and that the things which they have taken from us have been the products of the Temperate Zone, and the like, not produced or manufactured by them; but it is also true that in every case direct competition in like products has gone on through all these years and that our tremendous growth and consuming power has absorbed them all, and that, too, at a constantly increasing price.

In each case the cry was raised that they were an alien people, that our markets would be flooded with the products of cheap labor with which we could not contend, that their standard of living was lower than ours, that their soil was more fertile and their cost of living trivial as compared with our own, and yet in every case we have conquered competition and the like industries have grown and flourished here.

A new proposition confronts us now—a reciprocal trade agreement in some of the natural products of two contiguous countries with a like character of population, with a climate and soil very similar to that of each other, and with forms of government differing in few essential features, affecting the productive and consuming power of either people. Indeed, both parties to this proposed agreement are under the protective-tariff system, and from my point of view both are likely to continue that policy in the future, the United States striving to apply the policy on the fixed principle of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad as the true measure of its protection, and Canada supplementing its protective rate with direct aid from the Government in many of its industries. What is this agreement and what are the conditions under which it is to be put in operation?

In the first place it is not a revision of the Payne tariff law in any sense whatever, so far as it affects our relations with any country but the Dominion of Canada, and only to a very limited extent in our trade with Canada itself. Our total exports to Canada last year amounted to \$223,501,809, and of this only \$47,827,959 would have been affected under the terms

of this agreement. On those articles Canada would have remitted to us by the reduction of their customs duties \$2,560,579.04. Our purchases from Canada last year aggregated \$104,199,675, of which \$47,333,158 would have been affected, with the result that we would have remitted to them by the reduction of our customs duties \$4,849,933, more than one-third of which was on the single item of lumber in its various forms. So that of the total trade between the two countries, amounting to \$227,701,484, only 29 per cent would have been affected if this agreement had been in force. Nor does the agreement debar us from changing our present tariff law in any way we see fit in our dealings with any other country, or even in our dealings with Canada, except as to 41 paragraphs on the free list, which we agree not to make dutiable, and the 59 paragraphs in the dutiable list, the rates of which shall not be exceeded. There is nothing in the agreement which prevents either country from changing its tariff relations in any other respect at will, and there is no definite fixed limit of time when this agreement shall be terminated. It is a straightforward business arrangement for the reciprocal exchange of such articles as the representatives of both Governments believed, after most careful consideration, could be made with safety to each other and for the mutual advantage of both, and that would result in largely increased business transactions in other articles not directly affected or named in the agreement.

So far as Canadian preferential rates with Great Britain or Canada's trade agreements with France or any other country are concerned, this agreement has no more relation to them than it has to our exclusive tariff rates with the Philippine Islands, and both countries are free to do as they please with regard to those matters—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it disturb the gentleman if I asked a question at this point?

Mr. HILL. Not in the slightest degree, I hope.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman in the course of his address propose to explain the effect of the agreement between the United States and Canada upon those nations of the Old World that might ask for similar agreements on similar terms—

Mr. HILL. It has no effect whatever, so far as that is concerned, on any other trade agreement with any other country on the face of the earth.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman publish in the RECORD, in connection with his address, the exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of France and the exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Germany when the minimum tariff—

Mr. HILL. The gentleman had better publish that in his own speech. I understand he is to make some remarks. I will state to the gentleman I have a number of articles which I propose to publish as an appendix to my remarks and I would not like to make it too long.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I would like if the gentleman would—

Mr. HILL. I would very much prefer the gentleman would publish them as an appendix to his own remarks, if he has no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman will pardon me, for I am asking this in perfect good faith—

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This question has arisen among my constituents: I desire to know whether the making of this agreement would not lead other nations in the Old World that are not contiguous to the United States to step forward and ask for the same conditions as are contained in the treaty which we are now proposing to make with Canada.

Mr. HILL. We have no control over Canada; Canada has no control over us. We both publish to the world what is proposed to be done here. That is all there is to it, except the honor of two great nations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is hardly an answer to the question, I submit to the gentleman. I want to know if Russia, or Germany, or Austria, or France desires under the most-favored-nation clause to enter into a treaty, whether this agreement with Canada will not be such a precedent as will bind us to make a similar agreement with other nations.

Mr. HILL. The question of the gentleman has been answered for the last 30 years as to the effect of the most-favored-nation clause in treaties or agreements of this kind—that it has no relation to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then it must arise, so far as any other nation desiring to have trade relations with us is concerned.

Mr. SCOTT. I have a question along exactly that line, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I have seen it stated in the public print that England would be permitted to introduce manufactured goods at the same rate that is given the manufacturers of Canada. I wonder if that is true.

Mr. HILL. You will have to consult the State Department. I will say, as I have said repeatedly, that the only features of this agreement are named in the contract. They have no control over our actions outside of them; we have none over theirs.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman state his own opinion as to whether under this arrangement the manufactured products of England could come into the United States at the same rate of duty as those from Canada?

Mr. HILL. Not any more than we can import into the Philippine Islands manufactured products of England as the products of the United States. These are the products of Canada that we are dealing with, and not of Great Britain.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the bill itself make any provision to guard against the introduction of goods from England by way of Canada?

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will read the bill and the correspondence in connection with it he will find full information on that subject.

Mr. PICKETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I am willing to yield for a total of about seven minutes. The rest of the time I want to myself during this hour. I will yield if I can.

Mr. PICKETT. Is it not true that under the consideration which Great Britain and other nations give to the favored-nations clause that every European country—

Mr. HILL. I very much desire the gentleman would discuss that proposition in his own time. Really, I have not the time to do so.

Mr. PICKETT. I just asked the question—

Mr. HILL. The gentleman will pardon me if I insist on going on.

Mr. McCALL. Will the gentleman permit me just for a moment to give a statement that is based on a careful survey of the authorities?

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] will permit me—

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. That whatever tariff concessions in favor of imports into the United States from Canada that Congress shall adopt in return for tariff concessions by Canada in favor of American products will constitute on the part of the United States an exclusive and strictly preferential trade arrangement which will involve no violation of the tariff treatment of the most favored nations offered to the world in the statute minimum tariff of the United States. That is the position of the committee, and I believe that we can sustain it beyond any question.

Mr. HILL. I shall have to ask you in all fairness to me to conduct these discussions with each other after I get through, because my time is limited.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will permit me a minute, I wanted to suggest this: These questions are exceedingly practical, and it seems to me that everybody in the committee would be desirous of extending the time of the gentleman from Connecticut to answer just such questions. I know that we on the other side of the question certainly, if the gentleman will yield to questions of that sort, which seem to be very appropriate, will endeavor to get him more time.

Mr. HILL. I will be very glad to yield after I have finished what I propose to say in regular order, and if the time is then extended I will endeavor to answer any questions which I am capable of answering.

Now, who are the parties to this contract? First, the United States, with a continental population, by the present census, of 91,972,266 persons; and, second, the Dominion of Canada, with an estimated population in 1908 of 7,184,000.

During the preceding 10 years the United States showed an increase of population of 21 per cent. During the seven years preceding 1908 the Dominion of Canada showed an increase of population of 33.7 per cent. By the census of 1901 there were 127,899 of our people residents of Canada, and at the same time there were 1,179,807 Canadian people residing in the United States. Since 1900 497,892 persons have emigrated from the United States to Canada, 103,984 having gone there last year;

and there are probably to-day more than 600,000 of our people living in the Dominion and more than a million and a half of Canadians in the United States.

I will print in the RECORD a statement showing by the census of Canada for 1901 and the census of the United States for 1900—for the facts are not yet developed by the later census of either country as of to-day—the respective number of each considerable class of population in the two countries at that time, and it will be perfectly manifest that, taken as a whole, the racial conditions of the two countries are as nearly alike as they would be if no boundary line separated them and we were in fact one country.

United States, 1900.

[Population, 76,303,387.]

Native	65,843,302
British	2,783,082
Austria-Hungary	275,907
Holland	104,197
Chinese	81,534
Danes	153,805
French	104,197
Germans	2,663,438
Italians	484,027
Japanese	
Norwegians	336,388
Russians	423,726
Canadians	1,179,807

Canada, 1901.

[Population, 5,371,315.]

Native	4,671,815
British	390,019
Austria-Hungary	28,407
Belgium-Holland	2,665
Chinese	17,043
Danes	2,075
French	7,944
Germans	27,300
Italians	6,854
Japanese	4,674
Norwegians	10,256
Russians	31,231
United States Americans	127,899

Both populations are truly cosmopolitan and bound together by family ties, business associations, mutual interests, and living to a large extent with a like environment; both separated from the rest of the world by broad oceans on either side, but touching each other along thousands of miles of an imaginary boundary line, with frequent and cheap means of transportation of persons and property from the great centers of each country to those of the other; with no passport system or military espionage system enforced by either nation, as is done by the nations of Europe, and each and all as free to come and go as the citizens of New York and New England. Why should we not supply each other's wants and meet each other's necessities without any of the restrictions which govern and control our relations with the people on the other side of the ocean, where like conditions do not prevail?

Mr. PICKETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. PICKETT. If that argument is good, then—

Mr. HILL. That is not a question. I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. PICKETT. If the gentleman's argument is good about free interchange of trade with Canada, why, then, should it be limited to one class of producers and one class of products alone?

Mr. HILL. I am putting this whole matter on the basis of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and I will show before I get through that there is no difference in this case.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Then the gentleman is in favor of free trade between Canada and the United States?

Mr. HILL. I am in favor of unrestricted trade with any country where there is no difference in the cost of production there and here. [Applause.] I am absolutely in favor of protecting American industries to the precise extent of any difference that may exist, whether it raises or lowers tariffs.

Mr. PICKETT. Then I assume—

Mr. HILL. I must decline—

Mr. PICKETT. Then I assume you are in favor of extending our free list to all manufactured products of Canada, especially to the textile industries.

Mr. HILL. I must decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut declines to yield further.

Mr. HILL. It is not what nations produce that makes them sharp competitors with each other in the markets of the world, but it is the surplus which they have for export after their own necessities are met, and it is by such a showing, with reference to some of the articles included in this agreement, that I propose to demonstrate that no harm whatever can come to

either of these two neighbors by the ratification of the proposed agreement.

The largest crop in the United States is corn, of which we produced last year 3,125,713,000 bushels and exported 44,072,209 bushels. Canada produced 18,726,000 bushels and exported 5,881 bushels. She is not a corn country and never can be, by reason of her climate; but all over this broad land of ours the yellow tassels greet the rising sun, and the harvest pours a golden stream into the granaries of every State. For years we have supplied her wants at the rate of 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 bushels annually. The farm price of this product in Canada during the past year averaged 54 cents a bushel, and by the official reports of this Government ours averaged 48.8 cents per bushel, or 5 cents less than theirs. In all sincerity I ask you men from the corn States of this Union, Will not the free exchange of this product be mutually beneficial to both parties?

In 1909 Canada exported to all the world meats, both fresh and canned, including poultry and game, to the value of \$9,984,425, of which there came to the United States the trivial amount of \$272,413, while of the same articles we sold to her to the amount of \$1,958,909. If she had sent to us her entire surplus, it would have cost this Nation 9 cents per capita. As it was, we paid Canada last year about one-third of 1 cent apiece for her exportations to us of meat products. That certainly ought not to scare us. Should not every man from a corn-growing State rejoice at the privilege of a wider and freer traffic with her in all these products?

If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is here, I will take up the fisheries question now.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman wait a moment until I can get my material?

Mr. HILL. The entire product of Canadian fisheries in 1908 was only \$25,451,094. I think that will be a surprise to some of you. We raised oysters, clams, crabs, and lobsters enough in this country to almost equal in value the entire product of all the fisheries of Canada.

Our product is about \$54,000,000, according to the statement furnished me by the Census Department three or four days ago and taken from the new census. Canada exported \$22,444,767 worth, sending to the United States \$8,162,728 worth. We sent to her during the same year \$3,342,870 worth from our fisheries.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that those shipments were mostly oysters?

Mr. HILL. I do not know what they were. I think very likely, but oysters are just as important to Connecticut as the codfish is to Massachusetts. [Laughter.] If the entire product of both countries had been dumped upon our market this great Nation would have consumed it all at a per capita cost of \$3 cents to each one of our people. I submit to you that every consideration of health and economy would amply justify an increase of the supply of this food product manifold, and if it could be done it would be a blessing to all of us.

As the best evidence that, taking the product as a whole, we are not only able to compete but to drive Canada out of some of her own markets in spite of the existing duties—I notice my friend from Massachusetts rises to his feet and I am glad to have him—and that the throwing open of this industry to free and open competition is in strict accord with the principle of the difference in cost of production laid down in the Republican platform, I make the following citation of the proceedings of the Canadian Parliament, taken from the Toronto Globe, of February 6, 1911, with reference to the action of the Canadian Parliament concerning steam trawling of the North Atlantic fisheries:

The newspaper report says:

As an evidence of the good effect of the department's policy in encouraging and assisting the Maritime Province fishermen he noted that in 1908 the imports of fish into Canada had totaled 9,168,000 pounds, while last year this amount had been reduced to 761,000 pounds.

This had been due to the action of the department in paying one-third of the express charges on shipments of fish to Canadian inland points, and now practically the whole of the Montreal, Toronto, and other Canadian city supplies of fish were obtained from the Maritime Provinces instead of the New England States. After some further debate by the Maritime Province members the resolution was carried.

When it comes to the point that Canada can only prevent the absorption of her own markets by New England fishermen by paying the express charges on shipments of fish from the sea-coast to the interior, it is hardly worth while to figure the difference in the cost of production in this industry, and I commend a careful consideration of this proposition to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who seems, by the proclamations published in the lobby, to be so deliciously anxious about my consistency at the present time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HILL. If it is a question I will answer it, but if it is a reply to what I have said I prefer that he do it in his own time.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It is simply a question as to whether you have read in your own report the figures of exports of New England fisheries to Canada.

Mr. HILL. Every figure which I have taken, I think, is taken from official documents of the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the official documents of the United States—not from pamphlets.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. May I read that?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer that the gentleman wait, if he is going to reply to my remarks. I thought he wished to ask a question.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. I see that the gentleman from Connecticut has made a profound study of all the industries, both on the Canadian and the American side, and I wish to ask him if he discovered where either country has received any benefit from the high duty which has existed heretofore.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I will consider that before I get through. I do not care to cite the value of the forest products of Canada. In all the civilized world there are not forest products enough to meet the absolute necessities of civilized people, and within my own knowledge and experience lumber has steadily increased in cost and price until the problem now is to know what substitutes can be employed for it.

I believe that if there is one question upon which the American people are determined, it is that this steadily increasing cost shall not be enhanced by legislative enactment of any kind, and I go still further than that, and claim that the removal of the duty on lumber of every kind and character between this country and Canada—I do not know as I would say that in regard to Mexico, I do not think I would—but between this country and Canada would not be a violation of the principle of protection, but would be strictly in accordance with it, and that the opposition from the Northern States, at least, to such removal, both in the making of the Payne tariff bill and of this reciprocity provision now, is based largely on the desire of American owners of stumpage in Canada to secure the removal of Canadian restrictions upon the exportation of logs, and to prevent the necessary fulfillment of well-understood contracts which were made at the time that the greater portion of that stumpage was purchased.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Assuming what the gentleman says to be true, at all events it would be an excellent thing for the people of the United States, would it not?

Mr. HILL. I do not care to go into the ethics of that proposition at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I notice in the lumber schedule here that logs are not on the free list. Can the gentleman tell why that is?

Mr. HILL. Logs are on the free list in the tariff now. It was not necessary to put them in here.

Mr. HINSHAW. This will make it so that all lumber, except planed and tongued and grooved lumber—

Mr. HILL. Whatever is not changed in that reciprocity schedule—

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not true that the only change this bill makes, so far as planed lumber is concerned, is to admit lumber that is sawed only—planed?

Mr. HILL. In the rough. I am coming to that.

Mr. SWASEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that logs are free from Canada?

Mr. HILL. So far as the tariff is concerned; yes. Of course there is a restriction in Canada against their exportation save in manufactured form. They can not be exported in the log. The Provinces own the logs and have the right to do as they choose with them. There is no discrimination. Every Canadian is treated like every American with reference to it, and every Frenchman and Englishman is treated the same way. There is no discrimination made by Canada. They own the property and put it up for sale under those terms, and they have the right to make them, as you would have the right in selling your house.

In corroboration of this statement I cite briefly from the remarks of Mr. Edward Hinds, of Chicago, Ill., president of the

National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, as found on pages 90 and 91 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on February 4, 1911.

I asked Mr. Hines some questions and he said that he was answering them that day as Edward Hines. He appeared again as president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association. I then said, "Do you appear here to make any different statement than that which you made as an individual?" He said he did not, so I will not quote him but once:

Mr. HILL. Now, let us go back to the reciprocity treaty. I understand, Mr. Hines, that you are in favor of this legislation, provided the word "logs" is inserted in the proviso, so that all restrictions on the free exportation of logs are taken away, just the same as they are taken away on pulp wood?

Mr. HINES. I would answer that this way, Mr. Hill: If in your judgment you feel that after the lumber industry has suffered a cut of 37½ per cent, you want to make it absolutely free—

Mr. HILL. I do not want you to put it that way to me, because I would not quite agree with you on it that way. I think there has been an actual reduction in the wholesale prices of lumber—a good deal more than the difference in the tariff, and not affected by the tariff.

Mr. HINES. Then, I will answer you personally. What our association would say I do not know, as we have not had a meeting.

Four days afterwards he spoke as president of the association and confirmed the statement.

Being an American and a Republican and advocating here the protection of American industries, I can not see any reason why, with the logs on the other side of this imaginary line, with merely a stream separating us from them, the logs should not be taken and brought over on this side of the line and manufactured by American labor fed by American farm products, and everything that goes into the manufacture of lumber, like steel and saws and chains, comes from this side, so that we may get the benefit of that, when we can manufacture the lumber on this side as well as it can be done on the Canadian side.

How, if you can get labor cheaper in Canada?

Mr. HILL. What is the language you would suggest to put in this paragraph?

Mr. HINES. As to just the legal verbiage, I do not know that I am capable of suggesting that, but I would say substantially the same clause that applies to pulp wood, namely, when Canada and the Provinces abrogate their duty—

Mr. HILL. It would only need the insertion of the items. That is all provided for, so far as pulp wood is concerned.

Mr. HINES. I will have this inserted in red ink after this hearing is over and put it in proper shape if you would like to have me.

Mr. HILL. With that done, you would not appear here in opposition to the reciprocity treaty?

Mr. HINES. I could not say that, being president of this association.

Mr. HILL. I mean, speaking for yourself, personally.

Mr. HINES. But I would say this, that that would go a long way toward satisfying our members. With this clause changed we should not be in nearly as strong a position to combat your argument about free lumber as we are to-day.

Mr. HILL. Now, you would favor this reciprocity treaty, or you would not object to it, if the restrictions which the Canadian Government puts on Americans and Canadians, and everybody alike, that logs cut from public lands in Canada shall be manufactured in Canada, was removed? If that was removed and the timber and logs were treated precisely the same as the pulp wood which comes from the same lands—

Mr. HINES. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. HILL (continuing). I will admit that—then there would be no objection to this? Now, I agree with you, and I think they ought to come in the same as the pulp wood or the pulp wood ought to be restricted the same as the timber is restricted; but I wanted to get the precise position you occupy on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. You have it.

Mr. HILL. Now I understand it. I am much obliged to you.

That there may be no mistake as to the terms of these contracts, I will submit as an appendix to my remarks a copy of the terms and specification under which forest products are sold in Canada; a copy of terms under which an actual sale was made, dated June 22, 1909, in the Province of Ontario; and also, to meet the charge that it is impossible for Americans to compete with oriental labor in the lumber industry in British Columbia, I will submit a copy of the timber licenses issued, showing that so far as logging operations are concerned the employment of Chinese or Japanese is not permitted, and it is so stated in the contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was it ever contended otherwise on the floor of this House?

Mr. HILL. No; but it has been understood otherwise. I know the gentleman has not contended otherwise.

I call the attention of the gentlemen and the gentleman from Washington to the testimony of Mr. Skinner, one of the largest American manufacturers on Puget Sound in the State of Washington, in which he says he does employ oriental labor and pays them American wages, but the character of such labor is not satisfactory, and it is not as economical as American labor. If necessary, I can cite numerous other instances of like character within our borders.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. You can not point out to them where we have employed oriental labor in shingle mills. We are talking about lumber mills now.

Mr. HILL. I find that so far as this bogey of oriental labor in Canada is concerned—and if I am wrong, I hope some member of the Committee on Immigration will correct me—that Canada has to-day a head tax of \$500 on every Chinese and Japanese coming into the Dominion, and that no Hindu can come into Canada under any conditions unless he comes with an unbroken voyage, and there are no ships running with an unbroken voyage.

Let us be fair with our neighbors. We have got to live alongside of them for a good while, I hope.

I also submit an extract from the proceedings of the Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association of British Columbia, representing 60 per cent of the lumber industry of that Province, at their annual meeting at Nelson, British Columbia, on the 29th of January, 1909, at which they claimed they were subjected to unfair competition on rough lumber coming into Canada, and called upon the Canadian Parliament to promptly investigate the situation for the purpose of verifying their claims. They wanted "a tariff board," substantially, to come and examine them and see whether their statements were correct, and to place a duty upon lumber from the United States at the rate of \$2 a thousand on rough fir, cedar, spruce, larch, and pine lumber, and 30 cents a thousand on shingles, at the earliest possible date. In view of these facts, it hardly seems to me that it is necessary to consider the lumber question any further.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly. How much time have I taken, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied 50 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Then I can not yield. I must finish. I will ask unanimous consent that I may take about 5 or 10 minutes more than I intended, for the time that I have given up. I would like to finish my remarks.

Mr. PICKETT. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended 20 minutes, conditioned upon answering questions that may be asked him.

Mr. HILL. I will not impose upon your time, gentlemen.

Mr. MCCALL. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has been interrupted, and if it would be limited to a very few minutes—

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have already occupied more time than I intended to occupy. I asked the Chair for 1 hour, believing it would take me exactly 48 minutes. I have now taken 55 minutes, and I must decline to yield further.

Let us take the subject of butter and eggs.

The earnest effort made by some of our people to show that the butter and egg industry of the United States will be injured by competition with Canada seems to me to be at least unfortunate. To one gentleman who appeared in behalf of these industries before the Ways and Means Committee I put these questions:

First, "Have you any idea how much butter Canada produces?" Answer: "I have not." Second, "Have you any idea how much butter Canada exports?" Answer: "I have not." Third, "Have you any idea how much butter Canada imports?" Answer: "I have not." [Laughter.]

In view of those facts, the only conclusion I can come to concerning both of these industries is that the opposition to this reciprocity agreement, so far as those things are concerned, is based largely on apprehension and not on facts. The production of butter in Canada amounts to about \$44,000,000 worth. I have not got the pounds. You can figure it out for yourself. Ten years ago in the United States we produced 1,491,952,602 pounds of butter, all of which we consumed, except about 3,000,000 pounds. That was 10 years ago. Canada exported butter last year to the amount of 4,600,000 pounds to all the world, and if it had all come to the United States it would have furnished to our people about two-thirds of 1 ounce per capita.

Mr. SIMS. Per annum?

Mr. HILL. Yes; not enough for use on the breakfast tables of this great country of ours for a single day. Ten years ago the United States produced 1,293,662,433 dozen eggs, and the coming census will undoubtedly show that product greatly increased. Last year we exported a little over 5,000,000 dozen and imported 288,000 dozen. Canada sent us 39,360 dozen and sent to all the world only 160,650 dozen. If she had sent the entire amount of her exports to the city of New York alone, it would have furnished to each of the inhabitants of that city one egg once in two and one-half years. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. We could not get any egg now there. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Ten years ago the States of Ohio and Iowa each produced about the same amount of eggs that the entire Dominion of Canada produced.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from Connecticut yield to me for a question?

Mr. HILL. Excuse me; I can not. If I should yield to the gentleman from Iowa I would have also to yield to others, and I have not the time to spare.

Mr. GOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman how much this provision would cheapen the price of eggs in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, what injury can possibly arise from such a competition, and why follow comparisons further? If I had time I would like to make a few remarks on the barley question—

Mr. HINSHAW. How about wheat?

Mr. HILL. But, Mr. Chairman, I must pass on. The fact is that this great country of ours in its enormous expansion of industries has reached a point where consumption is rapidly passing production, and the continuation of high prices for food products is inevitable. I do not look for any reduction of these prices even if this reciprocity proposition is enacted into law. It will possibly stay the advance temporarily, but the causes of the increase are world-wide, and considerable time will be necessary to effect a readjustment. Of one thing only am I reasonably certain with reference to this matter, and that is that it is not the result of any tariff law, and that the effect of any tariff law enacted in accordance with the principles of either party in this country is absolutely insignificant, on the prices of food products, compared with the tremendous changes which are occurring from year to year in reference to them in accordance with the law of supply and demand.

The fact of the case is that in the last 10 years we have had come into this country nearly 9,000,000 people in addition to its normal, natural increase. Where have they gone? A report of the Bureau of Immigration says that in the last six years 5,900,000 have come in, and that eight-tenths of the whole number have gone into New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Does the Bureau of Immigration also state the fact that 40 per cent of those 9,000,000 people have gone back to the countries from which they came?

Mr. HILL. I do not know.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That is the fact.

Mr. HILL. During the last two years alone 50,000 have come into my own State of Connecticut and made their permanent residence there, and the census shows it. They have gone into the manufacturing and mining States. They have become food consumers instead of food producers, as they were at home. Most of them were food producers at home and they are food consumers here. They have reduced the supply in the countries from which they came; and if you doubt it, write to any missionary society in the United States and ask for their reports from the foreign missionaries, as I did in the last campaign. I have those reports and I would be glad to read them to you if I had time, as to the conditions in every other country in the world, caused by the withdrawal of their agricultural laborers over there and the sending of them here, where they do not go into agriculture, but into the manufacturing and mining States.

You gentleman on the other side of the House said it was a Republican tariff that produced the result. It was not. It was a world-wide movement, and you will find it out when you come to make your tariff. Do not make any mistake about that. I say frankly that I think no tariff, either such as you make or such as we make, changes this great question.

In addition to that, judging from the last census which we have just taken, it is as clear as sunlight that the cities have been building up at the expense of the farming regions. What is the result? Food producers here have been changed to food consumers, the demand increasing all the time and the supply falling off. Where now are the lands that for 40 years have been free to any settler who saw fit to go West and locate on them at \$1.25 an acre? They are gone. There are no good lands open for settlement in the United States except those taken from Indian reservations and bought from the Indians at a large price, or else the so-called arid lands. We have spent \$60,000,000 to irrigate those and loaned \$20,000,000 more last year for the purpose, and yet only 1,000,000 acres were ready last year for occupation, and that at an average cost of \$60 an acre. We can not hope to get food products off of land at \$60 an acre as cheaply as we could when the sod crop would pay for the land, as I saw it do in South Dakota. But that is not all, for the supply of cattle has fallen off. The great grazing pastures of the West are beginning to disappear. Now, the Government charges rent, and it costs more for grain-fed cattle from the farm than it does for the product of free grazing. As a result the supply of meat for the United States in 1909 was 30 per cent less than it averaged during the preceding five years.

Now, these are general observations applying to the whole country, which every man on this floor knows to be absolutely true.

Let me give you a striking fact about the section of country in which I live as proof that like conditions are existing there.

The census reports for New England for the period of 20 years, from 1880 to 1900, show the most remarkable industrial revolution that in my judgment was ever made in the history of the world since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden. In that period of time—20 years—15,344 farms in New England went out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more, in order to answer some questions.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may have time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask that his time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it will not do to increase time indefinitely; we shall have to be limited. I will say to my friend that the gentleman from Connecticut has very carefully prepared a speech, and it will not take more than five minutes to finish it.

Mr. HILL. It will take about 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I should like some time, to get an expression of expert opinion from the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. I will answer any question after I get through, and I do not think it will take me 10 minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut may be extended for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. HILL. I will be through in less than 15 minutes, and then I will be ready to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Fifteen thousand three hundred and forty-four farms cut into building lots, sold for residences to wealthy people from New York and Boston, made into private parks, or allowed to grow up to timber. That meant just so much less food production in New England. In that same 20 years there was an increase of population of a million and a half, and yet there were 17,000 less farmers at the end of that period than there were in the beginning. Five million acres of land that were cultivated in 1880 went out of tillage and cultivation. It was a tremendous change, and yet that was only half of it. That would only have reduced the supply. How about the increased demand? During that same time 25,360 new factories were built in New England. We put a billion of dollars into manufacturing. We took the boys and girls off the farms and brought them to the manufacturing towns and cities, and those boys and girls, who, prior to that time were hoeing corn and milking cows, changed their occupations and became consumers instead of food producers, as before. At the end of that period New England was paying \$420,000,000 in wages, against \$200,000,000 20 years before.

I have received the statistics of four New England States under the new census, and the process is still going on. In those four States in the last 10 years the farm acreage has decreased by 589,000 acres. The improved acreage has decreased by 734,000 acres and 1,602 farms have disappeared from the census list.

Now, you can explain these marvelous changes in any way you see fit, but one thing is clear to everybody, and that is that the food producers in this country are constantly decreasing and the number of food consumers far more rapidly increasing, and the result can not be other than that agricultural production will advance in like proportion, and in my judgment all of the agricultural wealth of Canada can not stay this change.

It is not peculiar to New England alone. The manufacturing center of the United States is steadily moving westward and is located in Indiana to-day, and the same problem which confronts us now in New England will soon confront every State east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio River.

What is true of the United States will in time be true of eastern Canada, because instead of being one solid country, practically inhabited, as ours is, from ocean to ocean, she is, in fact, two countries—Canada East and her great Northwest—

separated by a wide area north of Lake Superior more desolate than any land which I have ever seen unless it is the denuded mountains of Palestine. For that reason general comparisons between conditions in Canada and the United States are of little value, and much greater accuracy would be secured by making comparisons between the Eastern Provinces and the Atlantic States and the Canadian Northwest and our own country to the south of it. To aid our western friends in such comparison, I submit from the official statistics of Canada the value of lands in Canada in the respective Provinces and farm wages throughout the whole Dominion.

The average value of occupied farm lands in the Dominion of Canada in 1909, according to the Canadian Yearbook, was \$38.60 per acre, and if I am not mistaken that is much higher than the occupied farm lands of the whole United States. By Provinces it was as follows:

Prince Edward Island.....	\$32. 07
Quebec.....	43. 37
Saskatchewan.....	21. 54
Nova Scotia.....	30. 50
Ontario.....	50. 22
Alberta.....	20. 46
New Brunswick.....	23. 77
Manitoba.....	28. 94
British Columbia.....	73. 44

The price paid for farm labor according to the same authority averaged throughout the Dominion of Canada \$33.68 per month, including board. By Provinces it was as follows:

Prince Edward Island.....	\$25. 27
Quebec.....	33. 33
Saskatchewan.....	38. 30
Nova Scotia.....	31. 20
Ontario.....	31. 52
Alberta.....	40. 08
New Brunswick.....	32. 59
Manitoba.....	35. 95
British Columbia.....	45. 50

To you men from the Southern States this reciprocity agreement offers an open and ever-expanding market for your fruits, your early vegetables, your cottonseed oil, and other products of a totally different climate from that of Canada. A like advantage will come to the people of the Pacific slope with their citrus and other fruits. So far as New England is concerned, and the products of her factories, I do not find any concessions in these reciprocity provisions worthy of mention, and yet so far as I am informed our people stand for it, believing that the general prosperity which will come to Canada, and which also will inure to this whole country because of it are such as to justify that support, and that we and we only shall be to blame if we do not get our share of it. Indeed, I do not see how it is possible for Canada to make concessions in manufacturing industries, for compared with our wonderful development in that direction hers is insignificant.

The State of Ohio alone in 1905, with a much smaller population than the Dominion of Canada, had invested in manufacturing a capital of \$856,988,830, against an investment in all Canada in 1906 of \$846,585,023. In those industries Ohio employed 364,298 wage earners; paid them \$182,429,425, and turned out a product of \$960,811,857, as compared with the whole Dominion of Canada of 356,034 wage earners, and an amount paid for labor of \$134,375,925, and a total value of products of \$718,352,603. So that this single State far outstrips the whole Dominion of Canada in manufacturing industries. What concessions can she make? In this review I have left untouched the great industry of wheat production and the pulp and paper problem, preferring to leave those questions to be discussed by others.

I stand for this treaty as a whole, without any qualification and without any amendment, for, if I am rightly informed, it must be so considered by the Congress and it must stand or fall as a single proposition, except with reference to the paper and pulp schedule, upon which no final conclusions were reached by the negotiators. If I could have my way, there are some things in it which I would change—

Mr. FASSETT. Will the gentleman yield for one question there?

Mr. HILL. I will when I get through. I have no criticism to make upon any Member of the House who feels that the particular industries prosecuted by the people whom he represents upon this floor have not been cared for as he thinks they should have been.

That feeling is not confined to the United States, for I find by the perusal of the Canadian papers that the ratification of these proposals is looked upon by some citizens of Canada as absolutely destructive not only to their agriculture, their fisheries, and their manufactures, but also to the investments made by domestic and foreign capital in their railway systems and public improvements generally. So that we do not have in this country

a monopoly of the timid ones, who look upon any change in the commercial relations of the two countries as a change for the worse, no matter how small or comparatively unimportant it may be.

As a good illustration of the faculty for "seeing ghosts" in Canada as well as on this side of the line, I submit as a part of my remarks the first page of the Montreal Daily Star, under date of February 4, printed with scare headlines, under the title of "An appeal to Sir Wilfred Laurier, the one man who can save Canada."

Mr. Chairman, if instead of this very limited reciprocity now proposed between these two countries the question was presented to this House to-day of complete political union of both peoples in one magnificent government, holding full control over all the North American Continent between the Rio Grande and the Arctic Sea, no man here would say it nay. [Applause.] All of the local jealousies, neighborhood rivalries, and petty measurements of personal gain or loss, which are inseparable from a closer contemplation of the smaller problem, would absolutely disappear in the light of the glory of that greater achievement.

As long as I live I shall never forget the magnificent speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] at a Second Army Corps dinner in this city some years ago, when he portrayed to his audience the future of this Republic, embracing not only the North American continent, but the whole Western Hemisphere as well in his prophetic vision. [Applause.]

Neither my judgment nor my desire leads me to concur in such a view of the destiny of this Nation, but I do believe it is my duty to so act and vote as to tend to harmony and friendly relations with all of our neighboring countries, promoting the welfare and prosperity of each other, looking forward to more and more intimate commercial and political relations as governments where such conditions already exist among the individual citizens of each country, and, above all and beyond all, making it forever impossible that war should ever again come to this continent between peoples of the same race, with the same hopes and aspirations, and with a common trust in the divine leadership of the Father of us all. [Loud applause.]

Now I will answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASSETT. I would ask that the gentleman's time be extended long enough to answer one question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend that by suggesting two questions.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman be allowed five minutes for the purpose of answering questions and giving some information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended five minutes in order to allow him to answer questions. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. I will answer any question I can.

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to the distinction the gentleman drew as between all the other articles in these schedules and the wood-pulp schedule. Is there anything essential whatever which would prevent us amending the bill in all other respects and not affect the wood pulp, or vice versa?

Mr. HILL. A vital one.

Mr. FASSETT. What is that?

Mr. HILL. There was no agreement reached by the negotiators on the wood-pulp question. The foreign negotiators represented the Dominion of Canada—the Government. They did not represent the Provinces. They stated distinctly, and it was so stated in the correspondence, that they had no power to bind the respective Provinces, and therefore could not conclude a negotiation on that point.

Mr. FASSETT. Was not that true of all?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. The Dominion Government makes the tariff, but it does not own the timberlands.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is not it true that after Canada concluded her reciprocity treaty with France that treaty was amended by the French Senate on April 1, 1909?

Mr. HILL. I do not know enough about it to answer the question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. You will find the matter set forth in the tariff series No. 6, commercial convention between France and Canada, page 5, Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Manufactures—

Mr. HILL. I ask that the gentleman put the citation in his own remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I desire to ask for information as regard to wood pulp—

Mr. HILL. I said in my remarks I declined to consider wood pulp, because I understand the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, the master of the subject in the United States [applause], will discuss that proposition, and I yield to his superior knowledge of that schedule.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. We all undoubtedly respect the large knowledge of the gentleman from Illinois upon the wood-pulp question, but here is a bill upon which the gentleman has taken an hour and fifteen minutes in support of and upon which he has made the first speech in its behalf, and I apprehend that he can explain just how it has been made and answer certain questions as to its effect.

Mr. HILL. I said in my remarks there were two subjects which I desired to leave to experts—one, wheat, which I would be glad to discuss, and the other the question of wood pulp, which my friend, Mr. MANN, will discuss.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know what would be the effect of this amendment if we passed it?

Mr. HILL. I prefer to leave that subject and not to anticipate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think we ought to know before we pass this bill?

Mr. HILL. I think you will know before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] gets through with it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. POINDEXTER. This agreement provides for a number of concessions by the United States on manufactured lumber. What corresponding concessions are provided for in the Canadian tariff on manufactured lumber exported from the United States?

Mr. HILL. They make no corresponding concessions. You can not separate one concession from the other and say this offsets that, and that molasses will equal the sugar, and peanuts will equal the hickory nuts. But it is one complete proposition against the other. I will suggest, however, that Canada conceded to Pennsylvania and West Virginia \$489,000 of duty on her coal last year, and Pennsylvania in the last tariff bill, practically by the unanimous action of her coal operators, asked for reciprocal free trade in coal.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not ask the gentleman about coal.

Mr. HILL. Coal would very easily offset wood.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I asked you about the tariff on lumber, purely for information. What concession, if any, is provided for?

Mr. HILL. There is no separation of one concession or another, or offset from one to the other.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is there any reduction in the Canadian tariff on manufactured lumber?

Mr. HILL. It goes in free, of course, on the same terms as ours comes in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. I am very glad of it, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

APPENDIX.

ONTARIO.

SALE OF DAMAGED PINE TIMBER.

By authority of order-in-council, dated the 22d day of January, 1909, tenders will be received at the department of lands, forests, and mines up to and including Monday, the 22d day of February, 1909, for the right to cut the damaged red and white pine timber on the two blocks hereunder mentioned.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

1. Separate tenders to be made for each block.
2. Tenderers to state the price they are prepared to pay per thousand feet board measure for the red and white pine, in addition to Crown dues at the rate of \$2 per thousand feet board measure for all timber cut into saw logs, and per thousand feet cubic for square or waney timber, in addition to Crown dues at the rate of \$50 per thousand feet cubic. Red and white pine only to be sold.
3. The timber to be sold subject to the manufacturing condition, that is to say, that it is to be manufactured in the Dominion of Canada.
4. Purchaser to have until the 1st of June next to remove the timber.
5. Parties making tender to deposit a marked check for \$6,000 with their tender, such check to be forfeited to the Province in the event of the parties not fulfilling their contract.
6. The cutting of the timber shall be done in an economical manner and under the direction of an officer of the department of lands, forests, and mines. Any timber which, in the opinion of such officer, should be cut, delivered, and paid for, if left in the bush uncut or un-hauled shall be charged for at the tendered price and dues, which amount shall be deducted from the deposit.
7. The saw logs and timber cut by the purchaser shall be measured by a culler or cullers appointed by the minister of lands, forests, and mines, and the measurements made by such culler or cullers shall be final, and be the basis on which accounts for saw logs and timber, etc., shall be prepared by the department and paid by the purchaser.
8. In the event of any dispute arising as to measurement, the minister of lands, forests, and mines may, in his discretion, permit the purchaser to pay on the output of the logs when sawn into lumber,

excluding from such output only the class of timber known as dead culls, the price and dues to be paid on "mill culls and better."

9. The purchaser shall pay half the wages and expenses of the cullers who measure the timber in the forest, the department paying the other half. In the event of a remeasurement at the mill being allowed, the whole expense shall be borne by the purchaser, if the original measurement is sustained.

10. The sale to be subject to the Crown timber regulations, excepting in so far as the said regulations may be inconsistent with any conditions herein specified, and to such acts or orders in council as now exist or may hereafter be passed affecting timber or territory under timber license from the Crown.

The department does not bind itself to accept the highest or any tender.

Tenders to be marked "Tenders for damaged timber" and to be addressed by registered letter to the honorable the minister of lands, forests, and mines, Toronto.

Maps showing the locality in which the timber is situated may be obtained on application to the undersigned.

F. COCHRANE,

Minister of Lands, Forests, and Mines.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINES,

Toronto, January 22, 1909.

DESCRIPTION OF TIMBER AREAS—DISTRICT OF SUDBURY.

Block W. 5, area one-third of a square mile, situate on North Mozhabong Lake, flowing into Biscotasing Lake, about 25 miles south of Biscotasing Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Block W. D. 6, containing 2½ square miles, situate on North Mozhabong Lake, flowing into Biscotasing Lake, about 25 miles south of Biscotasing Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

LAND ACT AND AMENDMENTS—TIMBER LICENSE.

In consideration of ---- dollars now paid and of other moneys to be paid under the said acts and subject to the provisions thereof, I, W. S. Gore, deputy commissioner of lands and works, license ----- to cut, fell, and carry away timber upon all that particular tract of land described as follows:

The duration of this license is for -- year from the ----, 190--.

The license does not authorize the entry upon an Indian reserve or settlement, and is issued and accepted subject to such prior rights of other persons as may exist by law, and on the understanding that the Government shall not be held responsible for or in connection with any conflict which may arise with other claimants of the same ground, and that under no circumstances will license fees be refunded.

N. B.—This license is issued and accepted on the understanding that no Chinese or Japanese shall be employed in connection therewith.

Deputy Commissioner of Lands and Works.

LANDS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Victoria, B. C., ----, 19--.

ACTION OF CANADIAN LUMBERMEN IN REGARD TO TARIFF RELATIONS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

The Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association of British Columbia, the mills of which represent 60 per cent of the British Columbia capacity, held its annual meeting at Nelson, British Columbia, on January 29, 1909. The following paragraphs and resolutions taken from the proceedings will be of interest. It will be noticed that the secretary of this association complains of underselling in Canadian territory from American lumber manufacturers, and also that the association adopted a very emphatic resolution favoring the placing of a Canadian duty on American rough lumber in order to restrict competition by the American mills.

FROM THE SECRETARY'S REPORT.

Early last spring it was found that two or three large Montana mills were soliciting orders in southern Alberta at prices far lower than their regular lists, and as this appeared to be a case where the Dominion Government could enforce the "dumping clause" of our tariff, I took active measures to prevent any shipments crossing the line. After my visit to Kalispell the American travelers were withdrawn, but in this connection it must be recognized that the "dumping clause" in the case of lumber is really no protection for the reason that usually the only time that American manufacturers want our market is when their own market is demoralized; and in consequence their prices, while not representing "fair market value" by any means, are those offered when the lumber is sold for "home consumption." As similar action is being taken on the coast, I would recommend that this meeting again petition the Dominion Government, praying for a duty on rough lumber, and with the promised assistance of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, our claims will surely be given consideration at Ottawa.

FROM THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

It was moved by Mr. Lindmark and seconded by Mr. Magee that the president name a committee of three to draft a resolution embodying the views of the members of this association regarding the necessity for a duty on rough lumber entering Canada, and that copies of same be sent to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Mr. Fielding, Hon. Mr. Oliver, and the British Columbia members of the House of Commons. Carried.

Copy of resolution adopted by Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association, at annual meeting, Nelson, British Columbia, January 29, 1909.

Whereas the lumber interests of British Columbia and western Canada are still suffering from the unfair competition of rough lumber coming into Canada free of duty;

Whereas railway companies are still placing orders for lumber on the American side, such railway companies having been heavily subsidized by the Canadian people, of which subsidies British Columbia has to pay her proportion;

Whereas large quantities of lumber are waiting sale and mills are idle, which lumber was produced with protected machinery and protected supplies;

Whereas the manufacturers of western Canada have to-day in stock as much lumber as they have ever marketed in the best year heretofore experienced, and have increased their manufacturing capacity to such an extent that they are now able to supply a market at least three

times greater in any one year that sold in the best year so far experienced, viz, 1906;

Whereas the Hon. Mr. Fielding assured the lumber manufacturers of this district some years ago that the dumping clause would give us ample protection from American lumber, which is not the case for the reason that during the past 18 months the American market has been so demoralized that their mills have been selling lumber for less than two-thirds of its cost, and consequently exporters to Canada are willing to make affidavits that the price at which they are dumping lumber into this country is the "fair market value if sold for home consumption;"

Whereas the mills of this district were unable to operate one-fourth of their 10-hour capacity during 1908, throwing out of work thousands of men and causing millions of dollars of invested capital to remain unproductive;

Whereas owing to our excessive capacity to produce lumber it is important to preserve to Canadian mills our entire market;

Whereas the product of the mountain mills is from 75 to 85 per cent common lumber, the unfairness should be manifest of allowing American mills to dump into Canada their surplus low-grade material, which represents by far the largest portion of our output;

Whereas the most vital industry in the welfare of this Province is the only great industry on the American continent which is not afforded reasonable protection, and as there seems to be no just grounds to continue to sacrifice our interests: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Dominion Government be urged to give this matter prompt investigation for the purpose of verifying the claims advanced in this petition, and to place a duty of \$2 per thousand on rough fir, cedar, spruce, larch, and pine lumber, and of 30 cents per thousand on shingles, at the earliest possible date.

OTTO LACHMUND, *President*.
W. A. ANSTIE, *Secretary*.

AN APPEAL TO SIR WILFRID LAURIER, THE ONE MAN WHO CAN SAVE CANADA.

There is only one man in Canada who can avert the menace that lurks in reciprocity.

That man is Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He is the master of the situation. If he appeals to the loyalty of his followers, there is too much reason to fear that they will vote the agreement through. Like Sir John A. Macdonald, he has a genius for inspiring the confidence and attracting the love of men.

But it is equally true that if Sir Wilfrid declares that, on sober second thought, he dare not recommend this astounding commercial revolution to a people bound to preserve their independence, the agreement will not be ratified.

Moreover, such a declaration from Sir Wilfrid would be far more welcome to the bulk of his followers, both in and out of Parliament, than a bugle call to stand up and vote—and possibly die politically—for a bargain which may save the skin of the Taft Republicans, but will inevitably terminate the career of Canada as an independent nation.

If Sir Wilfrid were not of the stature of a statesman, we would not waste words on such an appeal. But there is no flattery in saying that the Premier is one of three or four great Canadians. He is a constructive statesman, with the long vision, the deep insight, and the steadfast courage that marks the rare race of nation builders.

DID SIR WILFRID KNOW?

He is a big enough man to change his mind, though we are not of the opinion that it is necessary for him to do so in this case. We do not believe that his mind has ever been made up to accept so sweeping a reciprocity scheme as that included in the Taft "life-saving" device.

This may sound like a surprising statement, in view of the fact that Sir Wilfrid's ministers accepted the Taft proposals and that they would not have dared to do so without consulting him on every item.

But it is no more than the truth that none of us realized the inward meaning of the shrewdly framed offer of the long-headed American Government when we first saw it. It was as cunning a trap as was ever laid. The master bargainers at Washington have not lost their skill.

It was particularly well baited for men who have an honest, lifelong belief that some sort of reciprocity between these two neighboring nations ought to be mutually profitable. For generations this school of thought has accepted as a basic tenet that it would be a good thing for Canada to secure access to the American market for its food products, provided it did not pay too high a price for the privilege.

So, naturally, two good reciprocitarians like Messrs. Fielding and Paterson went to Washington with their minds concentrated on the price. That was all they were thinking about. They must not pay too much. Everything they got would be clear gain. Uncle Sam would be sure not to give too much. But he would be equally sure to ask too much. They must watch the Canadian end of the treaty; the American end would take care of itself.

HOW THE TRAP WAS LAID.

Messrs. Taft and Knox undoubtedly calculated on this Canadian attitude of mind. They laid their plans accordingly. They knew that we were watching the hand that took, and were not watching the hand that apparently gave. So they disarmed suspicion by not betraying any great greed in "taking," and then deftly secured the assent of our representatives to a "gift" of such far-reaching effect that it engulfs our commercial independence and endangers our national existence.

They presented us with a Trojan horse. There are moments in the life of every nation when it is more dangerous to receive than to give.

We know now—what few of us realized at first—that such a "gift" can only be accepted by the barter of our commercial and, ultimately, our political freedom. If we turn the swollen stream of our food exports away from the west-east lines that carry it to the British market and send it along north-south lines to the American market—or, rather, the American "middleman"—we will utterly shatter the costly steel framework of this nation and debase the Dominion to a string of subject Provinces serving the convenience of the nearest American centers.

THE COST TO CANADA.

The "bridge" over the wilderness north of Lake Superior will be broken. Confederation will be cut at a half dozen vital points. The Provinces by the sea will be isolated, their industrial future negated; the arteries that lead to Old Canada will collapse through starvation, and the Americans will think of them chiefly as a collection of fishing villages.

Quebec will become the "back yard" and lumber camp of New England. Our farm produce will give the New England factories cheap food for their work people, without ultimately raising the price for our farmers, and our forests and mines will feed them with raw materials until they are literally eaten out by the enormous appetite of American industrialism. We will be lucky, indeed, if the national hemorrhage

stops there. The exodus of our sons and daughters to New England factory towns, which has been so severe a drain in the past, may well bleed us to death when Montreal has been strangled in its own dead railway lines, when the killing of the new Transcontinental has killed the legitimate hopes of Quebec city, and when our other promising industrial towns have found their home market flowing merrily over the border.

Ontario has been built on the growth of the West. Toronto might as well be a western city. What will happen when the West ceases to look to Ontario and turns its eyes to Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis, and the cities of the Western States? Nothing but a high national spirit and a tariff which makes the American frontier a reality can keep trade flowing across the empty country from Manitoba to Ontario and from Ontario to Manitoba.

THE WEST AND THE TARIFF.

Oh, but the tariff on manufactured goods remains, it may be said. For the present it does. But there is no surer law of trade than that products must be paid for in products. No people will long buy from a market to which they sell nothing. They never have done so in the history of commerce. Let the western man find his market to the south of the border, and he will want to buy from his best customers. If the tariff stands in his way, then so much the worse for the tariff. He will climb it while he must, but the East will not long be able to say "must" to the West.

As for the West, the farmer may get more for his grain at first, but at what a price? The great railways which have opened up his land will die in the middle and degenerate into merely local lines. The Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, will become "feeders" to the Hill system. They will no longer span a continent; they will shrink to the category of branch roads. The projected Hudson Bay Railway will be condemned before it is born. What is the use of a road to Hudson Bay for men with their eyes on New York?

The Georgian Bay Canal will never be dug. Why widen the Welland when the Erie starts from Buffalo? Why bother about the Long Sault dam when nothing but pleasure craft will use the St. Lawrence route? The Canadian ports will be sidetracked and Canadian shipping will put itself under the Stars and Stripes.

British Columbia is already expressing its opinion. It sees ruin in the pact. Its great fruit orchards will be blighted, and its magnificent forests are in peril. It, too, will be isolated from the rest of Canada, and the bargain by which the fathers of confederation brought it into the Dominion will have been wasted effort.

THE COUNTRY WAKES UP.

Now, all this was not realized when the Taft proposals first saw the light. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson—with their eyes on the "price"—may easily have missed the meaning hidden in the "gift." And if they could have missed it, how much more easily might Sir Wilfrid Laurier, busy at Ottawa, not have thought to weigh carefully that part of the bargain which was presumed by all concerned to be clear gain?

But from the day the agreement was laid on the table of the House of Commons the astonished country has studied nothing else. Its surprise has turned to amazement, and its amazement to panic. Experts on all the matters affected have offered their considered opinions. Men with their ears to the ground in all the provinces have reported what they hear. There is now a wealth of information touching the whole subject, available to everyone, which was not in existence when the prime minister gave a tacit assent to what he doubtless regarded as a mere business bargain.

Thus we do not hesitate to say that he might to-day decline to be responsible for this perilous pact without necessarily changing any opinion touching it he ever really held. He would be no more than forming a first opinion with all the facts fully before him. As we have said, even if a change is necessary, we believe that he is big enough to make it, but he is also big enough to have taken his time about coming to a final conclusion regarding so momentous a matter.

WHAT SIR WILFRID COULD DO.

Should his reasoned opinion be against ratification, the effect on the country and the Empire would be electric. His opponents would be deprived of an issue; and thousands of voters who have been thrown into alarm by the announcement of the agreement would rally to his support as a statesman whose "safety and sanity" could be relied on. He would in one move replace the political conditions that existed prior to the fatal "journey to Washington," and restore confidence in the steadfast fidelity of Canada to her own destiny among our own people and in the money markets of the world.

Financiers of every European capital are watching our behavior in the face of this sudden crisis. Are we going to keep faith with the men who invested their money in Canadian enterprises on the understanding that the development of Canada along national lines was a permanent feature of our policy; or are we about to destroy the value of millions of these investments by a wanton act of betrayal and close every money market in the world against us for years to come? We have been borrowing money for decades on the pledge that we would keep Canada commercially and politically independent, and to repudiate that pledge is equivalent to repudiating our debts.

Opinion in Great Britain, which was nervous to begin with, has fallen into dismay. They know perfectly well in the mother country that this fusing of our market with the American means the end of any policy of British reciprocity. The Empire can not—if it be carried—be united commercially. Our commercial affiliations will be with the United States; and where the treasure is there will the heart be also. If the ties of commerce are no longer to bind the British peoples together, how long will the exceedingly slender political ligaments last? On this point they have no delusions in the United Kingdom.

LOOKING TO SIR WILFRID.

Thus every British subject looks to Sir Wilfrid to save the Empire. Every money market in Europe, every Canadian enterprise that needs capital, every public body which must borrow, all look to Sir Wilfrid to save the credit of Canada. Every railway man looks to him to save the souls of our railways and so preserve the value of the money invested and keep the jobs of our railway men at their present number and wage. Every manufacturer—though comparatively untouched by this first blow—looks to Sir Wilfrid to save the home market; every merchant, every professional man, every workman dependent on the welfare of our industries, looks to him with the same hope. Can we not say that every farmer, when the farce shall have been played out, will realize that in imperiling his home market this agreement threatened him with a disaster in comparison with which a few cents on grain was not to be considered?

When it comes to our political future, the appalling magnitude of the issues makes it difficult to speak calmly. Here we enter a phase of

the matter where the business interests of the moment become mere dust on the glass through which we gaze into the long future. We are talking now as Canadians, and thinking only of Canada. Let us put aside for the moment any gratitude we may owe the Mother Country, and take the most selfish view of the subject possible. Surely we know that on the day British connection falls us, Canadian independence is lost. Withdraw from our heads the shield of a powerful British Empire, and how long will our loving friends to the south leave us with both our self-government and our self-respect?

WHAT ANNEXATION MEANS.

Now, what does annexation imply? First, it implies absolute free trade between Canada and the United States. Down come our tall chimneys! Useless are our railways for the east-and-west haul! Abandoned are our ports! Empty are our canals!

Next, it implies the opening of our natural resources to the American exploiter. Our forests will soon fall before the American lumberman and paper maker as have their own. Our mines will be bled into the pockets of New York stock gamblers. We will be stripped as bare as their own forest lands.

Next, it implies pouring our commercial and financial capitals into the big American cities. Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, St. John, Halifax, Vancouver will become suburbs of New York, Chicago, Boston, and San Francisco. Our urban growth will be stopped, and any development we get will be as the farm and mining camp and timber limit of the proud United States.

Next, it will destroy all our national institutions. Parliament will be replaced by Congress; responsible government by a four-year oligarchy; an unstained judiciary by the product of a political machine. For our fellow citizens of the French language and the Roman Catholic religion, it means the closing of their religious schools and the turning of their language out of the courts and legislatures. Their guarantees rest on British pledges, and would disappear with the flag of Great Britain.

But why pile up the agony? This country has no shadow of a notion of submitting to annexation. It can only be tricked into it. But we should not forget that nations have lost their independence before to-day by entering upon courses whose first steps were innocence itself. Soldiers hidden in Trojan horses have captured more citadels than have been stormed by frontal attack.

SIR WILFRID'S OPPORTUNITY.

To-day Sir Wilfrid has the ball at his feet. He is the one man to save the situation. The Canadian people never watched him so eagerly, so anxiously, as they are doing at this moment. Thousands of his best friends hope that he will see the true bearing of the tremendous issue which lies in his hands; and that they can add another jewel to his crown as a patriot-statesman who loves his country so well that he would not think twice of risking her life to put profits in the pockets of a few clamorous people.

This is not a business matter he is considering, but the political fate of Canada. In the seat of Sir John A. Macdonald, with the eyes of the empire-builders of history on him, with all the future waiting to award its judgment, he is deciding for or against the annexation of Canada to the American Union.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., February 10, 1911.

HON. SERENO E. PAYNE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

The Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce board of directors' telegram, requesting you to vote against the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty, sent without the knowledge of the entire milling industry of this city, as well as numerous other interested parties, all of whom are members of the Chamber of Commerce, and who are strongly in favor of proposed treaty. The petition, requesting the board of directors to send this telegram to you was signed by only 35 members out of a total of 605 members of the Chamber of Commerce, and represents the position of but a small percentage of its membership. A large majority being in favor of its passage, we strongly ask your support to the passage of this proposed treaty.

MILWAUKEE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill has proceeded with admirable energy and with indecent haste.

I have given the bill a great deal of consideration, and I am as unable to answer questions that this committee might put to me as to the effect, the provisions, or even the intentions of the proposition as was the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who has just taken his seat. The speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Chairman, sustained his reputation in this House by reason of its excellent phraseology and the vigor of its delivery, but I submit that every member of this committee is now disappointed that the first proponent of the bill on the floor has given the committee no idea at all of its provisions.

I used perhaps rather extreme language when I said that the consideration of the bill had proceeded with indecent haste, but let me elaborate. It was no fault of this House or anyone in it, and I take it it was not the fault of anybody else that this proposition came to the House so late as it did. We were not permitted to hear what the Tariff Board had to tell us on the important subjects embraced in this bill. It is a matter of general information that that board, so profoundly urged by many persons, so generously equipped by Congress, has had under consideration particularly the question of wood pulp; but we were not permitted to call those gentlemen before us or any of their experts for information upon that subject—

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GAINES (continuing). And that, too, upon the very heels of the action of this House in insisting that special boards

should always advise us upon anything that relates to making tariffs. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS], I think, rather hastily infers that I am not going to cover all the ground he has in mind, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PARSONS. You seem to be making the point that we are not getting anything from the Tariff Board. I want to ask the gentleman whether he voted for the bill providing for a tariff board.

Mr. GAINES. That is not important. I did not, because I knew that whenever legislation was demanded nobody would wait for a tariff board or for any other outside body to inform this House [applause], and because I knew the very proponents of the measure would be the ones unwilling to get any information from the board itself. I trust that will give the gentleman the information he wants.

Mr. PARSONS. I submit that we have just as much information about this bill as we had about the Payne bill.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman knows that that observation is neither relevant nor true, because we had much more information about the Payne law than we have about this one. We were not permitted to hear from the Tariff Board.

I earnestly requested that men from the State Department should be asked to come before us, in order that we might find out how this bill would affect our relations with other countries, how it would affect us under the most-favored-nation clause, and how it would affect the maximum and minimum provisions of our own tariff. I was anxious that we should find out whether, inasmuch as all the countries of the world have tariffs now in more than one column—having a minimum and a maximum tariff, but not using exactly our names, and some of them having at least three tariffs—a minimum, a maximum, and an intermediate tariff—as, for example, Canada, where there are three—I earnestly desired to get information as to how this sort of favoritism on our part toward Canada would affect our products when they go into other countries.

Will the higher tariffs of the other countries be put upon us because we have admitted the products of some other country at a lower rate than theirs? Certainly. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that while there may be gentlemen who have ready understanding of all such propositions, it was not unreasonable to ask that experts from the State Department should come before us on these questions. No member of the committee was willing to answer them. No gentleman who addresses himself to this committee in this debate, I will venture to say, will answer them, except to attempt to brush them away and say that they are of no importance whatever. And yet there is not a member of this committee who would not like to know definitely and specifically whether we will not be in a hopelessly inconsistent position, and therefore at a disadvantage with other nations, when we endeavor to enforce our minimum and maximum provisions, while discriminating ourselves as between the products of different nations. I will venture to say there is not a member of this committee who would not now very much like to know, if we make the discriminations proposed in this bill, whether we will not draw down on ourselves the highest tariff of France, of Germany, and the other countries which have, as we now have, a minimum and a maximum tariff for the purpose of compelling equal treatment amongst the nations of the world. It does seem to me so inconsistent that it ought to be answered by the proponents of this measure, if anyone of them can answer it. It does seem to me that it is an absurdity for the American Nation, just after we have passed a minimum and maximum tariff for the purpose of compelling the nations of the earth to treat us equally, that we should ourselves proceed to enact a discrimination in favor of Great Britain and her dependencies—Canada, I should rather say, and Great Britain and her dependencies—as against all the rest of the world.

Mr. FASSETT. Would it interrupt the gentleman if I were to ask him a question?

Mr. GAINES. No; certainly not. I will yield with pleasure.

Mr. FASSETT. Can the gentleman inform us whether any information came to the committee as to whether any foreign nation has been consulted or sounded out on that very line by the State Department before the treaty was made?

Mr. GAINES. The question of the gentleman from New York is exceedingly pertinent. I was endeavoring to inform the committee of that very fact. Not only did nobody come before us from the State Department with such information, not only was no information sent to us by the State Department, but when we earnestly asked for it, it was denied us. No opportunity was presented to get information from the State Department, or from the Tariff Board, or from anybody who would attempt to explain this. And hence, as the gentleman from New York will understand, I say that the consideration of the bill has proceeded with indecent haste.

Mr. FASSETT. Just one moment. I should like to follow that question up by another. Was there any expert evidence before the committee bearing on that line at all?

Mr. GAINES. None whatever, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I just want to suggest to my colleague that the State Department has gone on record in line with the implication in his interrogatory, in connection with the head tax, when the then Secretary of State advised the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that it would be unwise to attempt to exempt residents of Canada from the head tax in the immigration bill, because of the most-favored-nation clause of the treaties; and because of that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization first, and this Congress afterwards, made that particular exemption apply to any alien who happened to reside in Canada for one year.

Mr. GAINES. I wish the gentleman had taken that up with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], though I believe he rather declined to yield when questions of that sort were asked him, but said that the most-favored-nation clause had nothing in the world to do with it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES. Yes; I yield now rather than later.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If I understand the gentleman's position, it is that on account of the maximum and minimum provisions of our general tariff law and the treaties under them the United States would be unable to make any reciprocity agreement with any nation. Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. GAINES. My position is this: It seems to me, in view of the fact that we have ourselves adopted a minimum and maximum tariff for the purpose of preventing other nations from discriminating, and the further fact that other nations have minimum and maximum tariffs, so that they may apply a penalty to our products going into their markets if we do anything to justify them in doing it, it is desirable that we know two things: First, what the proponents of this measure think it means and would accomplish; and, second, whether our State Department has sounded the other nations of the world, to use the phrase of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FASSETT], in order to know whether this action on our part, which, as I shall presently show you, gives us very few advantages or none at all, is going to draw down on us justified retaliation by other nations that will cost us scores of times more than we gain under this badly drafted convention. [Applause.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Would not the same objection apply to the making of any reciprocity agreement with any country?

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman asks me a question so broad that it can not by any possibility be answered in full; but I think I may answer to this extent, that while I am not myself a believer in reciprocity in competitive products, yet, no matter whether the reciprocity is of a kind that I like or not, it seems to me in every instance before we enter into such trade agreements, before Congress proceeds to enact legislation of that character, we should have the most exhaustive study and information and the fullest light, including the correspondence that has taken place, in order to know what the effect may be with other nations and how our relations with them will be affected by any such proposition.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GAINES. I will.

Mr. LINDBERGH. There are 131 items in this proposed agreement, on which items there is a tariff—

Mr. GAINES. I am glad to hear it. I have been so busy endeavoring to understand the proposition that I have not had time myself to count them.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I want to ask whether there is any moral or legal obligation on our part not to put these articles on the free list hereafter without the consent of Canada.

Mr. GAINES. There is certainly no legal obligation, and I take it there is no moral obligation, for this reason: When we did have a reciprocity agreement with Canada, Canada eventually modified the conditions affected by that agreement. Her tariff laws, her laws as to the rate of tariff depending on the port of entry, were modified, making the valuation higher for importation if it was made through this country by way, for instance, of New York and across country, making her valuations higher and therefore her rates considerably higher than if the importation was made by the way of the St. Lawrence River. So that I can say that such modifications have heretofore been made by the other contracting party when we have had similar reciprocity agreements.

I want to say to this side of the House that in my opinion the time for the protectionists of America to make a stand has come. I do not propose, myself, to yield further, no matter whether the proposal comes from a Democratic caucus or from any source whatever. It seems to me that I might as well call

attention of gentlemen on the other side to the fact that this proposition is no more consistent with their profession of belief in a revenue tariff than it is with our profession of devotion to the policy of protection. Every Member on that side of the House is well aware that we must raise from \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000 either by direct taxation or by taxes upon imports, and if it is the policy of the Democratic party, pretending that it does not want to favor the manufacturing interests of the country, to enact a precedent which justifies putting everything else on the free list, and it is your purpose to raise the revenue on a few manufactured articles and give them exclusive protection, the people of this country will understand that your professions have not been in good faith or else that you have been very poorly advised as to the application of your own principles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no set speech with reference to this bill. I prefer, rather, to present a few arguments with reference to the bill for the purpose of seeing whether I might get the committee to wake up and think of this proposition.

I think I have as much modesty as any Member of this House, but I believe that if both sides of this body were free, if the Democrats had not proceeded to tie themselves up, against their judgment, by a caucus, and if there were not moral pressure on this side of the House, I could convince every member of this committee that there is not one ounce of reciprocity in this whole proposition.

In the first place, I shall never be in favor of any tariff system, whether it comes about by tariff enactment or reciprocity agreement, whether it be proposed by Republicans or Democrats, I never will favor any measure which gives the benefit to all the manufactured articles of the country and puts all the free trade on the farm products of the country. [Applause.] As I see it, the policy of protection is a consistent system which can be applied to all industries of this country with a certain definition. I believe that protection requires us to reserve the American market for the American producer of those articles which we are naturally adapted to produce in sufficient quantities to supply ourselves. And I repeat that I shall never join anybody, whether upon this side of the House or that, especially if it be a Democratic caucus, who proposes protection to manufactured articles, protection to the Beef Trust, for instance, and free trade on the farmers' productions. [Applause.]

Let us see what we have. Cattle, sheep, everything the farmers raises is to come in free. He gets no protection whatever, and yet the very first bracket in this bill provides a tariff on fresh meat, beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and all other fresh and refrigerated meats, except game, of 1½ cents per pound.

That is a reduction of one-sixth of the present rate; not as much reduction made on the products of the packers as the compensatory duty, because of protection to the farm animals; and I want to give gentlemen on that side and on this notice that before this bill comes to a vote I propose to offer an amendment to put the packers' products on the free list, and see the caucus-tied Democrats of this House vote against such a proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.] I can not take time now to read these articles at length, beginning with hams, meats of all kinds, canned meats, extract of meat, lard and compounds thereof, tallow, egg yolk and albumen, but all those things are protected by this proposed convention, and everything the farmer raises is put on the free list. How do you expect to go to the farmers of this country and ask them to justify such a proposition? Why, it will be, as stated by a witness before our Ways and Means Committee the other day, the former head of the Grange, I believe he was. He was asked by a Republican Member, or perhaps a Democratic Member, whether the farmers would go to the Democracy under these circumstances, and with language more or less well chosen he said the farmers of the country would support the devil before they would permit themselves to be abused by their friends, the Republicans. I suppose by the same token he also meant they would support the Democracy. [Laughter.] He did not go that far. I jumped to that much of the conclusion myself.

I said a moment ago that Canada has what is called a three-column tariff—a general tariff, an intermediate tariff, and the British preferential tariff.

I want to tell you something now that I believe is known to very few Members of this House. It took me some time to find it out. I wanted the proponents of this bill brought before us; but I have never been permitted to know who drafted the bill. I wanted the people in the State Department to come before us in order that I might find out some of these things that I am going to give you now. There is a very short time to go into the tariff law of Canada, item by item, and dig out these facts, but that is what we have to do, and my apprehen-

sion is that we dug out comparatively few of these facts. When it came, then, to the question of the Canadian tariff law, and when I insisted that we should have brought before us somebody who knew the law, who could cite us to the statutes, I was told to take the constitutional law of the Dominion of Canada, the statutes of the Dominion and all the Provinces, and work it out for myself. I have worked some of it out, and I beg the close attention of this committee while I proceed to give you some of the results of that investigation. As I said, Canada has a three-column tariff—a general tariff, an intermediate tariff, and a British preferential tariff. I have been able to find only two articles in the whole tariff upon which our rate of duty into Canada, after the adoption of this treaty, will be as low as the British preferential tariff—two articles, where Great Britain can not compete. On those we will have a tariff as low as the British preferential tariff, but upon all the other articles that I have been able to discover—and I think I have gone through the whole list—under this treaty we will not get a rate as low as the present British preferential tariff.

In the first place, attention ought to be called to the pending bill in the Canadian Parliament. It specifically provides that if any of the rates in this treaty for the entry of American goods into Canada shall be lower than the British preferential tariff, then the British preferential tariff shall be that rate, but in no event shall the preferential tariff be raised by reason of this agreement. At the risk of being tedious, let me go into some of the items. Let gentlemen take a copy of the bill to see how carefully they have guarded Great Britain's right to import. I want to make this general statement—it makes no difference how small the item is; it makes no difference how little chance Great Britain and her colonies might have to take advantage of the lower rate, yet upon the barest chance that Great Britain might want an advantage, or that some of the colonies might, that advantage is preserved to her under this agreement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. With the gentleman's permission, would not that mean that citrus fruits from the British West Indies might, to the prejudice of Florida, enter the United States by way of Canada?

Mr. GAINES. I am not so certain about that, but in view of the tax the citrus-fruit growers wanted to secure and the tax which they got in the Payne tariff bill, and that citrus-fruit growers are very little alarmed when anybody else is concerned, I take it, if citrus fruits had been in much danger, they would have been represented before the committee. Let us start out with egg albumen and blood albumen.

You would think that any proposition as unimportant as that they would not disclose a disposition to strive for an advantage. Certainly it would seem that wherever people are careful about a matter so insignificant it is a disclosure of a determination not to give an equal opportunity in their market to the people of our country. The British preferential tariff is 5 per cent; the treaty tariff against the American product is 7½ per cent. Take fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known—pardon me, for I am not endeavoring to make a speech, but to argue this question as if I were before a jury. I want to be understood as not desiring to be regarded as having spoken well, but rather as having made my point. I repeat that if that side of the House were not tied by the caucus binding it against its conscience and its judgment; if I had a free jury, I could beat this proposition, no matter how much people might like the general idea of reciprocity with Canada.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. GAINES. I venture to give you more credit for liberality and judgment than you modestly accord to yourselves, and I repeat, I believe I could. [Applause.] "Fish by whatever name known, packed in oil, in tin boxes or cans, including the weight of the package"—and the language here is always that of the Canadian tariff. No American drafted this proposition. Here is the Canadian tariff act of 1907, and the language of this treaty arrangement is Canadian language. No American drafted it, and I do not believe there is an American who ever knew what the language means.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Upon that point I would like to ask whether the gentleman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, or in any other way, has been able to learn what American experts, if any, helped the Government of the United States to shape this so-called compact.

Mr. GAINES. The answer to that is, I have not learned, and I have been diligent about it, and I have insisted and insisted and insisted that the information be given me until I have been held to be endeavoring to kill time on this matter. It was generally known I was against this bill, and therefore they seemed to assume, when I wanted this information, I was in some way endeavoring to delay the bill. The reason for that I do not

know. I was simply earnestly and diligently seeking that information.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is the gentleman, after his diligence, informed as to who in fact prepared this bill upon which we are called to vote here?

Mr. GAINES. We have asked, time and time again, and we were not able to find out.

Mr. PARSONS. Asked whom?

Mr. GAINES. I know now as much as I know about the man in the iron mask, who prepared this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAINES. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman if any of the negotiators of this treaty upon the American side appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if they did, did they furnish that committee with the information upon which they themselves acted.

Mr. GAINES. If they had been absconders from justice, they would not have been any farther away from our committee. [Applause.] They were not there that anyone could find out what were their names, what consideration of the question they had given, whom they had met, when and where, what conversations were had, and upon what information they acted, or anything else. Think of all the questions that you can in this line and then answer them in the negative, and you have the fact. [Applause.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Was the American Tariff Board consulted?

Mr. GAINES. For the sake of the American Tariff Board I hope it was not; but I know nothing about it.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAINES. How much time have I occupied, Mr. Chairman? I must not abuse the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOUTELL). The temporary occupant of the chair will state that the timekeeper is not here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES. In the absence of the timekeeper, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] may ask his question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Has the gentleman ever asked his colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] for information of any character with regard to this bill and been refused such information?

Mr. GAINES. I can not answer that. Some questions are embarrassing. I hardly know whether to tell the truth or to be polite. [Laughter.] We have endeavored to get the information, as I tell the gentleman, and it has been denied us, and if it will come out here, if any gentleman who is to follow me will give the information which I have stated I could not get and which every one of you knows he does not now have, then I shall say that the refusal or the failure to give me the information was of very little importance.

The fault, if there be any, may be cured hereafter, and I submit that it is a very reasonable argument to say that, after this notification, if the fault be not cured, and you are still left in ignorance, it is considerable proof, conclusive in fact, that I am not mistaken about what I am telling you either about lack of information or lack of ability to get it.

As I was saying before I was interrupted, the evidence is that no American drew this bill. The Canadian language of their tariff schedules is followed, and not the language of the American schedules. It says as to fish:

When weighing over 20 ounces and not over 36 ounces each, 5 cents per package.

The British preferential is 3½ cents per package.

When weighing over 12 ounces and not over 20 ounces each, 4 cents per package.

The British preferential tariff is 2½ cents, a little bit more than 50 per cent. Is it not obvious to every gentleman here that this is a mere sound and pretense of reciprocity? Can we compete in this country, with Great Britain having cheaper labor and cheaper supplies quite frequently, when Great Britain has an advantage of from 25 to 100 per cent under the tariff regulations?

Take the next item:

When weighing 36 ounces each or more, or when packed in oil, in bottles, jars, or kegs, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The British preferential tariff is 20 per cent, a 50 per cent advantage to Great Britain. Is that reciprocity?

Before I go on with some of the details, let me read something that I think ought to be interesting to my Democratic friends. Thomas Jefferson said:

Should any nation, contrary to our wishes, suppose it may better find its advantages by continuing its system of prohibitions, duties, and regulations, it behooves us to protect our citizens, their commerce and navigation by counter prohibitions, duties, and regulations also.

Free commerce and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations, nor are they likely to produce relaxation of them.

Does any Democrat here believe that the man who wrote that would clamor for reciprocity, and then, in order to get it, support a proposition which gives Great Britain and all her dependencies 50 per cent advantage in return for the substantial concessions made by us? Of all the negotiations I have ever known this seems to be the poorest job.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GAINES. I yield to the gentleman with great pleasure. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the thing is as bad as you make it out to be, how does it happen that there is serious opposition to it in the British Parliament and in the Canadian Parliament, if that is what you call their legislative assembly?

Mr. GAINES. I can not answer that; but let me suggest this to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], a gentleman of unusual ability in handling these matters—and if I am mistaken about facts correct me—I can not tell what notion of alarm, what misunderstanding, may be in the Canadian Parliament; I can not interpret their view, but if my facts are true I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri in all frankness and candor this question: If I am right in saying that the concessions we get do not put us down to the British preferential tariff, do you not think I am right in saying the treaty ought to be defeated?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not think your facts are correct or your conclusions either. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GAINES. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Is it not a fact that on the first vote taken in the Canadian Parliament on the subject of this measure the advocates of the treaty had a majority of somewhere between 25 and 30 votes?

Mr. GAINES. I so understand, and I think that should make it clear to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and persuade him that it is a bad thing. I never knew him to be warped in his judgment by that sort of mental process before. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps an explanation can best be had not by such reasoning back and forth, but by calling attention to the fact that the opposition in each of these countries comes from the special interests that would be hurt by the agreement.

Mr. GAINES. The answer is that that is not so. The gentleman from Kentucky had better come in with some information to impart here, rather than to make that sort of a charge against the people who are in opposition to this measure.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not mean to convey the idea that the opposition I referred to was represented by the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES. I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky does not mean any reflection on me. You can not stop that sort of an argument by a slur or a sneer.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not a sneer. It is a fact.

Mr. GAINES. It is not a fact, if the gentleman will allow me. The proposition I contend for is that this trade agreement violates the principle of protection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES. I would like in my own time to be allowed to conclude my replies.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am sure the gentleman does not want to be unfair.

Mr. GAINES. I think I have been very indulgent in the matter of yielding. My contention is that this treaty is not consistent with the doctrine of protection. It is not consistent with any idea of a revenue tariff. It is a poorly drafted proposition. Does the gentleman propose to say that if I am correct in saying that every concession granted here still gives Great Britain an advantage of 25 to 50 per cent would he still say it is good business and a trade that ought to be made? He is bound, I presume, by a caucus.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will my colleague yield for a very brief question?

Mr. GAINES. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did the gentleman from West Virginia ask me a question with a view to obtaining an answer?

Mr. GAINES. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not think the fact that England would still have a greater preferential rate than America would necessarily determine the wisdom of our making this treaty.

Mr. GAINES. That is an answer. I understand that.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GAINES. I have just yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman states that his principal ground of opposition to this bill is that it violates the doctrine of protection. Now, without going into detail as to whether the cost of production is greater or less in Canada than it is here, assuming that the gentleman from Connecticut is right in saying that the cost of production of all these articles was as great in Canada as it is here, I want to ask the gentleman from West Virginia this question: Suppose, for the sake of the argument, that in the 131 articles which I think are mentioned in this bill the gentleman knew that one of the duties placed by the bill was less than the cost of production, would he believe it a violation of the protective theory or the protective principle that one reduction below the line of protection as defined in our platform would be a violation of the doctrine of protection?

Mr. GAINES. I do not know that I caught the gentleman's question. If he means to ask me whether I would stop the enactment of an entire law or arrangement simply because of one detail, my answer would be no, unless the detail were vital. That is as far as I can answer the question from my understanding of it. Now let me go on. It is not a question of one item. I said every item except, I think, two. Great Britain permits us to have an even opportunity on corn meal and condensed milk. [Laughter.] I take it those are not important British articles. Take tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn in cans, and so forth—the British preferential tariff is 1 cent per pound, and the rate proposed in this treaty is 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman kindly advise me what the percentage of reduction in the British preferential is?

Mr. GAINES. I can not give the percentage of reduction of the British preferential. There are many articles. I am giving you the actual reduction on articles. Why confuse the question with the percentage?

Mr. HILL. If you will turn to page 52, you will see that the very first reduction made by Canada is 58 per cent on fresh meat. The British preferential is from 25 to 33; and if the gentleman will follow that column right straight along down there will not be the slightest doubt in his mind about the percentage of reduction on every article referred to in the treaty, because it is shown right there, and anybody can compare 75 and 25 without any trouble.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman certainly does not propose to tell me that on the items in this treaty we would get into Canada as cheaply as Great Britain would.

Mr. HILL. I certainly propose to say that we get in cheaper than Great Britain can on many of these, and on some not so cheaply, and the question is answered by that column of figures.

Mr. GAINES. It is not answered. The gentleman himself knows that the proposition presented to the Canadian Parliament provided that in no event should we have a lower rate than the British preferential tariff, and that if the rate in the treaty carried an item below the British preferential tariff then the British preferential tariff should take the treaty rate; but in no event should the British preferential rate be raised. The gentleman, it seems to me, is not as frank as he ought to be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I refer the gentleman to the percentages right in the treaty.

Mr. GAINES. I do not care what the gentleman has there in the way of percentages. I have always noticed, Mr. Chairman, that while they say figures will not lie, yet the most conscientious gentleman on earth ought scarcely to trust himself in the domain of comparative percentages for fear he might unwittingly mislead somebody.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman need not refer to me, because this is a printed document.

Mr. GAINES. But here is the Canadian law itself. You talk about general percentages in order to answer me, when I show you that as to every specific article, by the language of an official copy of the Canadian tariff, the British preferential rate is away below the treaty rate.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman has just called attention to the fact that the British preferential on canned vegetables is 1 cent per pound, and in this proposed treaty it is made 1½ cents a pound. Is the gentleman also aware of the fact that the French reciprocity treaty with Canada carries the same British preferential rate of 1 cent a pound on canned vegetables?

Mr. GAINES. I did not know that; and that is one of the things, it seems to me, we ought to have had called to our attention by the State Department. One question on which we ought to be informed is, Do we get any advantage? I have finally dug it out from the Canadian tariff and shown you that we do not get it as far as Great Britain is concerned, and here comes along the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who

has information that ought to have been given us by the special repository of such international information here in Washington, the State Department, which concluded this treaty, in order that we might not now be told for the first time that these treaty rates do not put us on an equal basis even with France.

How many other countries are there that would still have the advantage? [Applause.]

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to ask the gentleman in connection with the inquiry submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] if there was any testimony furnished to the committee with respect to the relative cost of production in this country and Canada on any article included in this convention.

Mr. GAINES. It seems to me that we had some testimony in regard to lumber, print paper, cheese, and fish, and I think no other.

"Macaroni and vermicelli, 1 cent a pound." That is \$1 for 100 pounds if we import it into Canada, and the British preferential is 75 cents a hundred pounds. Are we Republicans going to admit that we have so much advantage as a manufacturing nation over other countries that we can import into countries in open market when those other countries have an advantage in tariff rates? What becomes, in all consistency and good reason, of the argument that we have been making for protection in this country?

Biscuit, wafers, and cakes, when sweetened with sugar, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Let me call attention to the importance of this and the following item. Great Britain is the greatest manufacturing nation on earth in the line of confectionery—things that are sweet. Now, they have the benefit of free sugar over there. Our rate is 25 per cent ad valorem, and the British preferential rate is 17½ per cent ad valorem; again, 50 per cent advantage to Great Britain. The language is copied exactly from the Canadian tariff laws, so that there can be no question about the construction, and when it comes to construction their precedents will be the ones to be selected when it becomes necessary to determine what the treaty means.

Biscuit, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruit, or confectionery—

There is the same difference in favor of Great Britain; not the same difference precisely, for the rate is 32½ per cent ad valorem under the treaty, and 22½ per cent is the British preferential tariff. When I said the same difference I meant the same relative difference of 50 per cent advantage to Great Britain.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. What is the reduction on biscuits? It is 22½ per cent, and that is 2½ per cent higher than it was under the Dingley law.

Mr. FORDNEY. If that is so, where does the reciprocity come in?

Mr. GAINES. I confess, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the effect of the remark. I am talking of what the rate would be from this country into Canada under the treaty, and Great Britain would have an advantage of 50 per cent.

Mr. HILL. Under the Dingley law the rate was 20 per cent, and it was raised to 50 per cent by the Payne bill, and now put back under the reciprocity to 22½ per cent. Can not we stand it?

Mr. GAINES. Either the gentleman from Connecticut is vastly confused or else I am. I am not talking about our tariff as against Canada; I am talking about Canada's tariff as against us. What has the Dingley law or the Payne law to do with the exportations from here into Canada? I am following up with a statement to prove from the record that the concessions that are given to Canada and that Canada gives us are nowhere equal; that, as a matter of fact, Canada gives us nothing, and that everything seems to be given to Canada, while we are left with a higher rate of duty when exports go into Canada than Great Britain would have—

Pickles, cherry juice, mineral waters, and imitation of natural mineral waters in bottles or jugs, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

I confess I was unable to find that language in the rapid examination I was compelled to make of this Canadian tariff, but I did, however, find that when not bottled the water was introduced from this and all other countries under a general tariff free of duty. It seems to me we do not get anything there.

"Farm wagons, and finished parts thereof," 22½ per cent ad valorem under the treaty and 17½ per cent to Great Britain. "Plows, tooth and disk harrows," and so forth, 15 per cent under the treaty, 12½ per cent under the British preferential tariff. "Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horsepower and

traction engines for farm purposes, hay loaders, potato diggers," and so forth, and things of that sort, from the United States into Canada, under the treaty provision, 20 per cent ad valorem, and the British preferential tariff is 15 per cent. We would not have an even chance on these articles with the other nations of the world anywhere, with the sole exception, that I have been able to discover, as I have already said, of corn meal and condensed milk. We are, I presume, the only country that produces much corn meal, and therefore Great Britain did not fear our competition. As to the condensed milk trade, I do not happen to be advised.

"Cutlery, pocketknives, penknives, scissors, shears," and so forth, articles that use a great deal of labor, articles in which Great Britain is supposed to have a peculiar advantage in the markets of the world, 27½ per cent ad valorem. Do we get in there under even terms? Not at all. The British preferential tariff is 20 per cent, and the treaty tariff, as I say, 27½ per cent. They have over 33½ per cent advantage under this.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken a great deal of the time of the committee and I shall hurry along to one other thing and then I shall leave this debate. It was with a great deal of regret that I saw the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] take his seat without attempting to explain to the House what was meant by the lumber and wood-pulp and print-paper provisions. It does seem to me that in an opening speech we should have had this information. It is an exceedingly difficult thing to understand. I do not complain of any gentleman making his own speech in his own way, but in the opening of a debate like this some gentleman ought to give us some kind of explanation of what is meant by the language of the proposed measure. In the progress of the hearings I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] what the language in the bill meant, and he said that I had a good mind and might study it out for myself. I repeat that, notwithstanding my disposition always to accept such complimentary allusions, I yet had such profound confidence in the judgment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and also was so very fond of him personally, that for a minute or two at least I was inclined to let him do my thinking for me; whereupon he said that "the putative author of a bill was not entitled to full credit for all of its provisions." [Laughter.]

Now, then, the introducer of the bill was unwilling—no, not unwilling, but unable, for we must be perfectly frank about it—to tell us what the original language meant. It may be that this language can be thoroughly cleared up. I do not claim certainly that I understand its provisions as contained in the report of the majority. If I understand its provisions—not to read them at length, for there are so many parenthetical clauses they are confusing—it means this, that if we will admit the print paper of Canada into this country free, Canada will not then admit our print paper into Canada free until not only Canada herself, the Dominion, but every one of the Canadian Provinces, has taken off her restrictions on the export of wood and wood pulp to this country. In other words, if I may state it again, we do not get anything from them until they remove their restrictions against us. There is no reciprocity of any kind in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GAINES. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is it not also true that under the bill as introduced the obligation was upon the Canadian Government to remove all restrictions against the importation from this country into Canada of our print-paper products, whereas that has been stricken out by amendment, and the Canadian tariff law remains as it is?

Mr. GAINES. My answer to that is that I think the gentleman is right, but I am so absolutely unable to understand the original provisions for myself or to get the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the introducer of the bill, to inform me, that I can not make a comparison between this language and other language whose purport is still more confusing and perplexing to me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? The statement of the gentleman was not correct, in that it is at all within the power of the Dominion of Canada to remove these restrictions. It is not within the power of the Dominion itself, but only within the power of the various Provinces.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is it within the power of the Dominion of Canada to remove all restrictions against the importation from this country to their country—

Mr. LONGWORTH. But it is not in the power of the Government to remove certain restrictions, but in the power of the Provinces.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. But it was made the duty of the Dominion of Canada, as conditioned by our removal of restrictions regarding exports from there to this country, that they would remove all the tariff against our print paper, and by the amendment of the committee we strike out that and leave it without any duty upon Canada whatever regarding that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended so that he may have as much time as our colleague from Connecticut had.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I think I can conclude in 10 minutes. I do not wish it to depend upon the time the gentleman from Connecticut used.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GAINES. In order to understand this treaty at all with reference to wood pulp and print paper, perhaps it is necessary to bear certain propositions in mind. In the first place, the Canadian Government has no power to control the Provinces in many respects. In how many respects they can not control them as to international relations, I do not know. By such Canadian law as I was able myself to find, I learn that they can not control a provincial government when it undertakes to impose export duties on products going out of that Province. I found that the Provinces of the Dominion may impose export duty on articles leaving the Provinces and going into other countries, and even going into other Provinces of Canada than the one imposing restrictions. Then to-day I found out, from the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut, this information, that they may impose a restriction upon immigration from abroad, a head tax. At any rate, they can impose restrictions upon the export of their lumber products, and do. It was said through every day of the hearings up to the last that Canadian Provinces could not impose a restriction upon the wood products cut from any lands other than Crown lands, and yet we found from the law we have, a copy of the law which we have inserted in the hearings, that one Province does impose restrictions on lands other than Crown lands—that is to say, on privately owned lands.

The law reads as follows:

There shall be due and payable to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, a tax upon all timber cut within the Province of British Columbia, save and except that upon which a royalty is reserved by this section or that upon which any royalty or tax is payable to the Government of the Dominion of Canada, which tax shall be in accordance with the following schedules.

And this law, a copy of which was inserted in the hearings, which I hold here for the examination of any gentleman who wishes to see it, goes on and specifies that such tax shall be rebated, provided the lumber and timber cut is manufactured in the Province of British Columbia. Now, we went clear through these hearings until the last day under the impression that the provincial governments of Canada might put a limitation upon the export to America of logs cut from Crown lands, but they were absolutely powerless to put any of these burdensome and irritating export restrictions upon private lands; and yet, at the last moment, we found that they not only can but do impose restrictions upon the export of logs from privately owned lands.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to say that all the Provinces of Canada do not impose this export tax?

Mr. GAINES. Some of them do not and some of them do.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Then I understand that some do and some do not.

Mr. GAINES. But any of them can impose these restrictions at any time they please, and let me call the attention of the gentleman to this, because it may obviate his question: That under this treaty, as I understand its provisions, wherever there was any timber upon which an export charge was not made, then the product of that timber could come in free. But we could not get anything in there free, any of our wood products or our print paper, as long as any part of Canada maintains any export restrictions against us. So that if Ontario and Quebec want to do so they may remove their restrictions, but they accomplish the embargo on similar products into Canada if they get any part of Saskatchewan, or whatever you call it, to put on the restrictions. That is the way the thing works.

I repeat that there is not an ounce of reciprocity at any stage of this bill. The bill is so bad it does not count for even good free trade, and I hardly know how I could characterize it worse than that, a reflection that occurs to me because I see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] sitting right in front of me. [Laughter.]

Mr. SWASEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if, by the amendment you put onto that bill, the pulp and paper industry gets any advantage that they do not now enjoy without reciprocity.

Mr. GAINES. I do not think they do at all. I am bound to take refuge behind the same fortress that shielded the embarrassment of the gentleman from Connecticut, and say that while the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], now Chairman of the Whole House on the state of the Union, understands, probably, its provisions, no member of the Ways and Means Committee can possibly answer that question. [Laughter.]

Mr. SWASEY. Let me inquire further: Under that amendment all the free pulp wood that the American manufacturer can avail himself of is that which is cut on private lands, as you understand it?

Mr. GAINES. I think that is so.

Mr. SWASEY. And upon that the Government reserves in that treaty the right to manufacture and enter free of duty into the United States; but in no place in that reciprocity agreement is the duty upon print paper going into Canada remitted. Fifteen per cent still remains if we ship print paper to Canada.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. As it was drawn in the bill, if the gentleman will permit, the remission of the duty on print paper going from this country into Canada was required of the other. It was left out. It leaves no obligation upon the Canadian Government in this matter.

Mr. GAINES. None whatever; and the Canadian Government, with commendable frankness, has called our attention in the correspondence itself to the fact that they have no jurisdiction of any kind to control the Provinces in this respect, and they have even gone so far as to call attention to the fact that they do not think there will be any reciprocal operation immediately or in any short time.

Mr. SWASEY. Then, stating it briefly, the situation is this: For all print paper manufactured on private lands, or any other place where the prohibition is removed, they have to come into the American market free of duty, but if we go back into Canada, under no condition can we go except on the payment of 15 per cent duty.

Mr. GAINES. That is what the language means, unquestionably.

Now, some gentlemen have argued, as I understand them, on this very complicated proposition, that the amount of privately owned lands is small, and that therefore the Provinces would desire to get their products into this country, and therefore they would remove the restriction. But I find, upon a further examination, that that is not correct. There have been in Canada great grants of railroad lands for the purpose of railroad construction. Those grants of land are in fee, but are not located. Now, the owner of Crown-land leases may, under a practice they have there, have these railroad grants located on his lease. The railroads, therefore, would locate their grants where desired, upon the leased timber land in many places, and in that way they would get considerable exportation from these Provinces into this country without inducing any part of Canada to remove any of its restrictions at all.

Mr. Chairman, I have already occupied the time of the committee longer than I expected to do. As I said, I come before you without any set speech, but I wanted to argue this question if I could. Study it and examine it—you can not do it in an hour, or a day, or two or three days, I am afraid—and you can not take the hopeful and optimistic and eloquent language and statements and assertions of gentlemen like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]. But if you will really go to work on this proposition until you understand it, you will find what I said to you two or three times to be true, and I have purposely repeated it, that it might sink home and be remembered, that there is not an ounce of reciprocity in any point in this proposed arrangement. Gentlemen on this side, I want to say to you that I remain a protectionist, unchanged and undismayed, and I would like to see the old doctrine have more life and vigor amongst all the Representatives of the Republican people of America. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate resolution 347.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. CHARLES J. HUGHES, Jr., late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. ELKINS and Mr. HUGHES, the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate resolution 346.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. STEPHEN B. ELKINS, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. ELKINS and Mr. HUGHES, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 10208. An act authorizing the resurvey of certain land in the State of Wyoming;

S. 9271. An act for the relief of William H. Walsh;

S. 8608. An act to authorize the President of the United States to place upon the retired list of the United States Navy Surg. I. W. Kite, with the rank of medical inspector;

S. 4678. An act to adjust the claim of certain settlers of Sherman County, Oreg.;

S. 6645. An act for the establishment of a park at the junction of Maryland Avenue, Fifteenth Street, and H Street NE., Washington, D. C.;

S. 5036. An act for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Ky.;

S. 9124. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection of the United States post-office building at Sistersville, W. Va.;

S. 9123. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection of the United States post-office building at Grafton, W. Va.;

S. 10189. An act to amend an act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes;

S. 8008. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its existing Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease, and for other purposes;

S. 6878. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands by the Reclamation Service by exchange, and for other purposes;

S. 9239. An act to change the name of Fort Place from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE. to Irving Street.

S. 8645. An act to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia;

S. 288. An act for the creation of the police and firemen's relief fund, to provide for the retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such retirement, and for other purposes;

S. 6582. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906, as amended by act of Congress approved March 2, 1907;

S. 9954. An act for the relief of Lincoln C. Andrews;

S. 10012. An act for the establishment of acetylene-gas beacon lights, lighted buoys, and fog signals at or near Point Heron, Point Glover, Apple Cove Point, Bush Point, Point Partridge, and the improvement of the lights and fog signals at Marrowstone Point and Slip Point, Puget Sound, Wash.;

S. 10010. An act for the substitution of a first-class fog signal to replace the present Daboll trumpet at the Fort Point Light Station, Cal.;

S. 10017. An act for a flashing light, a fog signal, and a keeper's dwelling at the Santa Barbara Light Station, Cal.;

S. 10008. An act for a flashing light to replace the fixed light now at the Point Fermin Light Station, Cal.;

S. 9241. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to revive, with amendments, an act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia," approved July 7, 1838;

S. 10172. An act for the relief of Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy;

S. 10757. An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904;

S. 10022. An act for establishing aids to navigation on the Yukon River, Alaska;

S. 10023. An act for establishing a light and fog-signal station on Richardsons Rock, in the Santa Barbara Islands, Cal.;

S. 10025. An act for a fog signal and keeper's quarters at the Trinidad Head Light Station, Cal.;

S. 10410. An act to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala.;

S. 10275. An act relative to joint operations of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

S. 5420. An act to provide for a public building at Live Oak, Fla.;

S. 9970. An act to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah;

S. 10141. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy;

S. 10256. An act establishing a light and fog-signal station on Michigan Island, Lake Superior;

S. 10257. An act establishing a light and fog-signal station at Portage River Pierhead, Mich.;

S. 6550. An act for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore;

S. 865. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased;

S. 7648. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

S. 10011. An act for establishing a light and fog-signal station on the San Pedro Breakwater, Cal.;

S. 10210. An act to direct the construction of a lightship and its maintenance near Orford Reef, off Cape Blanco, Oreg.;

S. 10177. An act to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Lighthouse Establishment, and for other purposes;

S. 10015. An act for rebuilding and improving the present light and fog signal at Lincoln Rock, Alaska, or for building another light and fog-signal station upon a different site near by;

S. 10536. An act directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lot No. 20, square No. 253, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

S. 9556. An act to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex.;

S. 9011. An act to provide for the granting by the Secretary of the Interior of permits to explore and prospect for oil and gas on unappropriated and withdrawn lands;

S. 1882. An act for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased;

S. 7031. An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary;

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution directing that a portion of square No. 857, in the city of Washington, D. C., be reserved for use as an avenue and improved; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution authorizing the printing of the message of the President, together with the report of the agent of the United States in the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 24123. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of William M. Wightman, deceased; and

H. R. 30571. An act permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. McCALL. Now I yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized. Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I first yield a part of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], which carries into effect the reciprocal tariff arrangement between the United States and Canada, known as the Canadian reciprocity agreement, which agreement was negotiated by representatives of the Governments of the two countries, the United States and Canada, and submitted to Congress by the President in his message of January 26, 1911.

The negotiations which led to an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian Government in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation were commenced by the President of the United States several months ago through his communication addressed to the British ambassador. It was agreed, as stated in the correspondence between the Canadian ministers and the Secretary of State, that an agreement between the two

countries should be made, which agreement should not take the formal shape of a treaty, but—

that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such agreement by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.

The McCall bill to carry into effect this agreement between the two countries was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, every Democrat upon the committee voting therefor, as I am informed, except the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. My reasons for giving my support to this reciprocal trade agreement may be summarized as follows:

First. I believe that reciprocity is correct in principle, tending to the expansion of our trade and commerce, tending to good will in commerce, and avoiding commercial warfare.

Second. Provided we are unable to arrive at these results by our tariff laws, I have repeatedly advocated in Congress in a number of speeches reciprocity treaties or trade agreements.

Third. At this particular time it is wise political policy for the Democratic Party to give its support to this bill, which is a reduction of some of the prohibitive schedules in the Payne tariff law, will tend to expand the trade of the United States in the Dominion of Canada, and is in part a recognition of the principles the Democratic Party has contended for in Congress and in its platforms.

To reject this bill, which is regarded by a majority of Democrats as a step in the right direction, simply because it emanates from a Republican President, is by no means a sound argument and would destroy a decided political advantage to the Democratic Party. The effect of this measure can not result otherwise than to divide the Republican Party, whose latest tariff enactment, the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, was repudiated by the people at the polls in November last, and will be revised by a Democratic House of Representatives. Suppose the President were to send a message to Congress proposing a reduction of the taxes upon the people in the woolen schedule of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, should we reject the proposition and vote against it if it was in line with Democratic principles simply because it emanated from a Republican source?

Fourth. That Democratic support of this bill is regarded as wise political policy by the Democratic Party leaders in Congress and by the Democratic Representatives in Congress is manifested by the unanimous action of the caucus of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, which adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the Canadian reciprocity agreement negotiated by the Reciprocity Commission of the Dominion of Canada and the President of the United States, while not formulated in accordance with Democratic platform demands, is a reduction of some of the prohibitive schedules in the Payne tariff law and will tend to expand the trade of the United States in the Dominion of Canada, and is in part a recognition of the principles the Democratic Party has contended for in the Congress and in its platforms: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this caucus indorse the Canadian reciprocity agreement and bind ourselves to vote for a bill carrying it into effect.

Fifth. The agreement must from the necessity of the case contain concessions on the part of each of the contracting parties, and therefore, to become effective, is from the nature of the case neither divisible nor amendable and must be accepted or rejected as a whole. If there be any doubt upon this question, certainly it is true that the agreement would have to be again considered by the representatives of the two countries and again submitted to the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada if amended in any material respect. It is undoubtedly true that many of us would be glad to see certain amendments made in this reciprocal trade agreement, but the effect of such amendments would undoubtedly be to delay, postpone, and finally defeat the bill. That the agreement must be accepted or rejected as a whole was made clear by the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, if he be correctly quoted. The following report of his attitude appears in the Associated Press dispatches:

WASHINGTON, February 5.

That any amendment to the Taft reciprocity agreement, if adopted in the House, will be equal to a rejection of the proposed treaty, was the declaration made by Representative PAYNE (Republican), of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, during a hearing on the McCall reciprocity bill Saturday.

Mr. PAYNE's assertion was made when Mr. FORDNEY (Republican), of Michigan, offered an amendment to the wood-pulp schedule, while Edward Hines, president of the National Association of Lumber Manufacturers, was being examined. Mr. PAYNE declined to allow the amendment to be read and declared:

"This bill will have to be adopted as a whole or rejected. Any amendment to it will be equal to a rejection."

"Where did you get that information?" demanded Mr. FORDNEY, and a rather spirited discussion ensued, in the course of which Mr. FORDNEY, of North Carolina, declared:

"Well, it is a poor way to start this tariff reform to ask us to accept this whole proposition without any opportunity of amendment."

Sixth. If either the United States or the Dominion of Canada be at a disadvantage by reason of this reciprocal trade agreement, it is subject to future change and revision, the whole matter not being in the shape of a treaty, but in the shape of legislation which may be amended or repealed or changed by a Democratic or Republican Congress.

In the letters exchanged between the Canadian ministers and the Secretary of State it is stated:

It is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations, now happily prevailing and promote the commercial interests of both countries.

The reciprocity treaty with Canada of 1854, negotiated under the administration of Franklin Pierce, a Democratic President, bound the two countries for 10 years. But this reciprocal trade agreement embodied in this bill is subject to change by a future Congress if found to be unjust or disadvantageous to either country or any interest of either country or its people.

Seventh. The benefits of this reciprocal trade agreement to the people of my own district and State, apart from any question of principle or wise policy, are clear to my own mind and can not be disregarded. The people of my district and State who are interested in trucking, including the large number interested in the cultivation of strawberries for northern markets and those engaged in the manufacture of cottonseed oil in my State and in the South, an industry which has grown to the proportion of fifty to sixty millions of dollars annually in value, and others, will be greatly benefited by this reciprocal trade agreement by reason of enlarged markets in Canada.

Eighth. While in a Republican revision of a Republican tariff bill, the Payne-Aldrich bill, I was unwilling to vote to place lumber upon the free list, I took that position, with more than 40 other southern Democrats, for the reasons stated in my former speeches, and because it seemed to me to be an unjust discrimination against one particular class of our people. I did my best to prevent such discrimination; but a vote against this bill would be contrary to my advocacy of reciprocity in the past as a correct principle, against my party, and to the exclusion of the interests of other constituents, which would be neither right nor just.

THE PENDING BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, as stated in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, I believe, "is based upon just principles and designed fairly to secure the mutual advantage of the two nations." In an arrangement like the pending one, as the President, who submitted this agreement to us, says:

The exact balance of financial gain is neither imperative nor attainable.

The duties proposed to be remitted by the United States yield a larger revenue than those remitted by Canada, but Canada's concessions bear a much larger proportion to her total income than do our concessions to our total income. Canada is our second largest customer, as well as bound to us by ties of blood and kinship.

The committee in its report says:

When population is taken into account, there is no country in the world that approaches Canada in amount of purchases from the United States. When cotton, in which we have a practical monopoly and which foreign nations must buy from us, is excepted, the United Kingdom is the only country which purchases a larger aggregate of our products. Our splendid trade with the German Empire takes only \$258,000,000 of our exports each year, as compared with \$242,000,000 which we sell to Canada. When cotton is deducted from the two accounts, Germany, with eight times as many people as Canada, buys from us only \$120,000,000, as against Canada's \$231,000,000, or only a trifle more than half the aggregate taken by the latter country. France annually buys from us \$116,000,000 in total value, or \$54,000,000 with cotton excluded. Even the United Kingdom imports from this country but \$307,000,000 in value exclusive of cotton, or barely one-third more than is taken by her colony. Canada buys from us 50 per cent more than she takes from all the other nations of the world combined. Each year her seven or eight millions of people buy of our products as much in value as Great Britain exports to the 300,000,000 people in her Indian Empire. He must be blind indeed who can not see the significance of her remarkable preeminence in the commerce of the United States. In methods of production, scale of living, and racial characteristics no other nation so strongly resembles this country.

Objection is made to the bill because it is alleged that the agricultural interests and farmers of the country will not be benefited and will be injured by a reduction of the tariff upon their products. It is a well-known fact that the tariff upon farm products has long been regarded as a mere sham and pretext to induce the farmers to vote the Republican ticket and stand for the protective policy of the Republican Party, while

enormous profits are reaped by the highly protected manufacturers of the country upon everything the farmer buys. So far as the farmers of my own section are concerned, the eastern North Carolina strawberry truckers have been urging me for years to endeavor to have removed the duty of 2 cents per pound upon berries imposed by the Canadian Government, thereby giving them the free entry to the Canadian market. They now ship to New York and Boston and other points, and could easily ship into Canada.

Those of the farmers who are interested in the prosperity of the cottonseed-oil mills would like to see removed the duty of 17½ per cent upon southern cottonseed oil.

Taking the country as a whole, it is contended that the prices of wheat would be affected by this agreement. There is little risk in the assertion that our tariff has never affected the home price of our wheat, however beneficent it may appear upon the statute books to our farmers. The prices of wheat in the United States, Canada, Russia, and other wheat-exporting countries are substantially adjusted with reference to the Liverpool price. The exports of wheat from the United States to Canada are greater than from Canada to the United States.

It is a well-known fact that a tax on raw cotton would mean nothing, would produce no revenue, and be only a subterfuge; that a tax on wheat, barley, and corn is no protection to the American farmer, and is merely placed there as a subterfuge to mislead him and to lead him into a trap to vote for high protection on manufactured articles. That is the position the Democratic Party has always taken. To say that to put an import tax on raw cotton would raise the price of cotton, when the world's market and competition in the world's market fixes the price of cotton, is absurd. To say we should put a tax of 25 cents, as the Payne-Aldrich bill does, on wheat, where a surplus of that product is raised in this country and a large surplus is sold in the markets of the world, for the purpose either of protecting the American farmers or to raise revenue, is a ridiculous statement, for it would do neither. On the other hand, the growth of our population is such—

that our consumption is pressing upon our production, and the day is not far distant when we shall become importers of wheat.

When that time shall come, and instead of having a surplus we shall not produce enough for our needs and we shall become a buyer rather than a seller in the open market, obviously that circumstance will raise rather than lower the world's price. As the committee well says in its report:

That price will be fixed by the world's supply compared with the demand. The necessity of importing wheat will then, for the first time in our history, make any tariff we may impose upon its importation a factor in fixing our domestic price. When that condition shall exist, will it be desirable to employ a tariff rate to make still higher to our consumers the price of wheat in the world's market? Such a course would certainly not be necessary to the prosperity of our wheat growers, who are prospering with their price fixed by the general supply and demand of the open market, and who, indeed, have never known any other condition.

It would be inhuman to the great mass of the people to enter upon the policy of increasing by law at the moment that there should be a domestic scarcity the price of the bread they eat, in order to increase the profits of an already profitable industry. When that time shall come, it will be a blessing to all our people and in a larger measure to those who are poor that they can turn to the near-by wheat fields of Canada. The most odious of all taxes ever devised by government is a tax upon bread. That food has a place near the elemental substances, like air and water, which are necessary to the preservation of our lives. Such a tax is not felt by the rich and well to do, but it bears with especial weight upon the poor. For the Government to intervene artificially to increase the price of bread would be to add to the load borne by those already overburdened, who can only with difficulty procure the means of subsistence, and it would tend to increase suffering and shorten life. The American farmer will not desire to augment his prosperity in any such a way. Certainly he is not likely to borrow trouble over a condition that may not appear for a decade.

The pending bill, Mr. Chairman, is a measure in the interests of the great mass of the people of the country and broad and statesmanlike in its purpose and effect.

As has been well said by my colleague from Pennsylvania, HON. A. MITCHELL PALMER, it is doubtful if this bill is a Republican measure.

It is rather a belated acknowledgment of the disappointment of the country in the Payne bill. We are considering a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, but it might well be entitled "A bill to reduce many of the duties levied under the act of August 6, 1909."

That law the people condemned at the polls last November. Doubtless the President perceives, judging the future by the past and judging from the storm of popular wrath which met the Payne bill at the polls and elected a Democratic House, that some action must be taken to meet the demands of the people.

Mr. Chairman, neither I individually nor any Democrat nor the Democratic Party as a whole is responsible for the passage

of the Payne-Aldrich law, nor are we responsible for the action of the President in negotiating this trade agreement nor for any of the defects of this trade agreement. Whatever is good in it we accept for what it is worth, expecting to modify and supplement it by future Democratic legislation.

Before I leave this subject of the pending bill, without going into the details of the measure, which have been fully presented by my Democratic colleagues and are well known through the press, being contained in a summary issued by the Department of State and in many trade journals, I desire to call attention to the benefits which will be derived by the newspapers of the country and indirectly by the people of the country under the paper clause of the reciprocity agreement.

The amendment to the McCall bill to carry into effect the paper clause of the reciprocity agreement perfects the bill in accordance with said agreement. It is not an amendment to the bill which would in any way prevent its passage by the Canadian Parliament. The effect of the amendment in the reciprocity agreement with reference to paper and pulp wood is stated by Mr. MANN, of Illinois, very clearly.

Mr. MANN says:

The duty now collected on paper coming from private land is \$3.75 a ton. Under this agreement we propose to give it up. The duty collected from print paper coming from Crown lands is \$5.75. That we propose to retain as a differential against paper made from Crown-land pulp wood in order to bring a natural inducement to remove the restrictions so that they may get the right to export paper free, they giving us the right to import pulp wood without restrictions.

The effect of the paper clause of the reciprocity agreement in benefiting the people of the country is stated by Mr. NORRIS in his statement before the Ways and Means Committee, which I here insert:

THE PAPER CLAUSE OF THE RECIPROACITY AGREEMENT—STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN NORRIS, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PAPER OF THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, FEBRUARY 9, 1911.

Mr. Chairman, I regard the Canadian reciprocity arrangement now before you as the greatest economic advance that has been made by the United States in the present generation. It broadens our markets. It promotes interchanges that will immediately and directly benefit 90 per cent of the population. I appear as the representative of newspapers which pay more than \$55,000,000 per annum for news print paper. They are deeply concerned in the paper and pulp clause of the treaty, and they ask you to approve that clause exactly as it appears in the agreement.

The tangle of the American Government with Canadian Provinces and the tariff burdens imposed upon print paper have added more than \$6,000,000 per annum to the price which newspapers would pay for raw material under normal conditions. The complication with Canada and the excessive duty have enabled American papermakers to combine for advances in print-paper prices. They have an organization that is more oppressive and more elusive than the General Paper Co. which the Government suppressed in 1906. The paper makers are systematically starving the market. The entire stock of paper on hand at the beginning of this year was less than an eight-day supply for the newspapers of the country. In December, 1910, they exported more print paper than Canada shipped to us.

Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich law, though the duty on print paper had been reduced \$2.25 per ton—that is, from \$6 to \$3.75 per ton—the paper combination has advanced prices \$2.50 per ton and threatens further advances. Publishers whose contracts are expiring find that they can not get any terms except from the mill which had supplied them. A uniform price of \$45 per ton has been established by the papermakers. It makes no difference what the freight rate is within a given zone.

At the instigation of the print papermakers, the American Congress attempted to impose coercive measures upon the Province of Quebec. The disastrous results of that policy are now seen in the withdrawal by Quebec of 95 per cent of all the available pulp-wood supply of that Province. It has been trying to starve the American mills and to force their transfer to Quebec. The paper clause of the pending reciprocity agreement overcomes all the difficulties of that situation.

The snarl with the Provinces of Canada has been completely avoided by an entirely new turn to the stipulations, which now follow the wood—not the Province. If wood is free from restriction, such as wood from private lands, the products of that wood will come into the United States free of duty.

The distinction between wood free from restriction of exportation and wood that is not free will show itself in various ways. Print paper made from wood cut on lands subject to restriction will be liable to a duty of \$5.75 per ton of paper. That duty will be prohibitory in competition with paper made from wood cut on private lands. A barrier of \$5.75 per ton on print paper will confront such products until the Quebec government removes the prohibition. The revenues which the Province now obtains on wood cut from its Crown lands and shipped in manufactured form to the United States will be diverted from the Quebec treasury to the owners of private lands. The pressure from holders of Crown lands upon the provincial authorities for an opportunity to reach the greatest market in the world—that of the United States—will be irresistible and a diplomatic victory in the removal of restrictions will have been achieved without harshness, or coercion, or ill feeling of any sort. Each side will obtain an advantage, and that is the element of a good trade.

The effect of the pending bill upon the people of my own district and State, or rather some of the benefits to North Carolina products by the proposed Canadian reciprocity, are stated in the inclosed communication secured by me from the

Bureau of Trade Relations, which I also insert as a part of my remarks:

The Hon. CHARLES R. THOMAS,
House of Representatives.

FEBRUARY 3, 1911.

SIR: Referring to your recent visit to the Bureau of Trade Relations in regard to the effects of the proposed Canadian reciprocity arrangement on the products of North Carolina, I beg to inclose herewith, at the request of Mr. Pepper, with whom you discussed the matter, two copies of his memorandum on this subject.

Very truly yours,

JOHN BALL OSBORNE,
Chief, Bureau of Trade Relations.

NORTH CAROLINA PRODUCTS BENEFITED BY THE PROPOSED CANADIAN RECIPROCIITY.

Cottonseed oil will enter Canada from the United States free of duty under the pending reciprocity legislation. It is at present taxed by Canada at the rate of 17½ per cent ad valorem. The value of Canada's concession of free cottonseed oil may be measured by the fact that in the calendar year 1910 we exported to Canada \$1,111,443 of cottonseed oil, on which she collected approximately \$195,000 in duties. The concession is of interest to North Carolina since the manufacture of cottonseed oil, etc., ranks among her leading half-dozen industries, according to the United States census of manufacturers of 1905, which states North Carolina's output of the oil at 6,269,062 gallons, valued at \$1,600,950.

Fresh vegetables and fruits are made free by Canada under the agreement when imported from the United States. Her rate upon potatoes has been 20 cents per bushel, and upon most other vegetables 30 per cent ad valorem. Upon fresh fruits her general rate has been 2 cents per pound, apples being taxed 40 cents per barrel. During the year ended March 31, 1910, the United States shipped to Canada fresh fruits and vegetables aggregating \$2,137,000 in value, which were taxed more than \$500,000 by Canada. The removal of all restrictive duties by Canada on this class of importations offers a large opportunity for North Carolina's early potatoes and garden or orchard produce. North Carolina produced \$1,498,000 of potatoes during the calendar year 1909.

Oysters in any state will be admitted by Canada free of duty when from this country. Heretofore canned oysters have been taxed 3 cents per package when in pint tins and 5 cents per package when in quart tins, and these rates have been well-nigh prohibitive. North Carolina put up \$177,000 of canned oysters in 1905.

Farm wagons from the United States will be admitted into Canada at a reduction of 10 per cent from her former rate, which was one-fourth of the value of the wagon. During Canadian fiscal year 1910 Canada purchased \$218,000 worth of farm wagons from the United States. North Carolina might compete for a portion of this business, inasmuch as her manufactures of wagons and carriages in 1905 were valued at \$2,304,000.

RECIPROCIITY A CORRECT PRINCIPLE IF WE CAN NOT OBTAIN GENERAL TARIFF REVISION.

I have heretofore repeatedly advocated reciprocity as a correct principle if we could not obtain tariff revision, making four or five speeches upon the subject. Upon the Cuban reciprocity bill, which was adopted by the Democratic Party in caucus just as the Canadian reciprocity bill, I advocated closer and freer trade relations with Canada for the benefit of North Carolina truckers, especially the strawberry growers. Also, in speaking upon the expansion of southern trade as to our cottonseed-oil products, an industry which has grown to the amount of between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000, I spoke for reciprocity with France and Germany.

In my speech on the bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902, delivered in the first session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, on November 17, 1903, I said:

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to debate the pending bill, but I feel constrained to do so to-day in the limited time allotted to me because I believe that this bill is a step in the direction of tariff reform and the breaking down of the high rates of the Dingley tariff law of July 24, 1897, and because I hope it may prove also a step in the direction of freer trade relations with other countries, including the Dominion of Canada, thereby benefiting the people and constituency whom I have the honor to represent.

The Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their report filed on yesterday, declared:

"We regret that the party in power has not seen its way to confer still further benefits upon citizens of both nations by providing for even freer and yet more untrammelled and unrestricted commerce between them. As long as the present party is in power we can perhaps hope for tariff reductions and revision only from reciprocity treaties. It is a piecemeal process, but it is better than no process at all. We hail it as a harbinger of future reciprocity treaties with other countries, especially those upon the American Continent, and notably our neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada."

At the opening of this session of Congress I introduced the bill which I hold in my hand, and which provides for the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada, especially with the view to the abolition or modification of the seventy-fifth item of the customs tariff of Canada of 1897, which imposes a prohibitory tax of 2 cents per pound, the weight of the package to be included, as duty upon American strawberries and other berries imported into Canada.

Upon the one item of strawberries alone, to which I have referred, the abolition of the Canadian customs tariff would mean a saving of thousands of dollars to my constituency and the opening up of new markets in Canada to North Carolina, the South, and the whole country. Whatever differences of opinion exist in both parties as to tariff rates and schedules, there is no question but that the high rates of the Dingley tariff law need wise revision, and that commercial agreements with Cuba, Canada, and other countries are in line with Democratic ideas and steps in the direction of tariff reform and wider and freer trade relations with the world.

Reciprocity—wise and not sham reciprocity, and which means freer trade relations and just and equitable tariff revision—is good Democratic doctrine; and while we are moving in this direction let us open up the markets north of us in Canada as well as the Cuban market south of us, for the benefit not only of my own people, but of the whole country. [Applause.]

On February 4, 1905, in the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, in speaking upon the diplomatic and consular bill, I advocated the ratification of the reciprocity treaties—known as the Kasson treaties, negotiated by Mr. Kasson with France and other countries under and by virtue of the authority of the Dingley tariff law, approved July 24, 1897. I particularly urged the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France for the benefit of the South and the southern farmer and our cottonseed-oil industry. In that speech I said:

Sooner or later we must have stagnation in our home markets and commercial war or reciprocity and industrial expansion. The South's progress is in part the progress of the whole country. Grant us by means of legislation or reciprocal agreements with other countries new and larger markets for our trade and it will be one of the greatest strokes of administrative policy.

I again insisted that we should have tariff revision and the lowering of the tariff walls for the benefit of the consumers of the country and the expansion of our trade; but if this could not be obtained that we should give some measure of relief to the people by means of reciprocity treaties which would open up new markets for the products of our farms and factories and enable the farmers and manufacturers of the United States to dispose of their surplus products.

I insisted that unless such course was pursued by the Republican administration and if the exactions of the high rates and schedules of the Dingley tariff law were continued the effect must be that retaliatory measures would be resorted to by the other nations of the world, and that we would lose new and valuable markets for American agricultural products and manufactures. Among other things, in that speech I said:

I appeal to the majority of this Chamber if we are not to have freer trade relations by means of a revision of the high rates of the Dingley tariff law, at least for favorable action upon the treaty of reciprocity with France negotiated by Mr. Kasson. It will be a great stroke of governmental policy which would rebound to the interest of the whole country and to the credit of the administration. Its benefits would be especially felt in the enlarged markets opened to the southern cottonseed oil mills and the higher prices paid for the products of the southern farms.

Again, on January 13, 1906, at the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, in speaking upon the Philippine tariff bill, I again advocated reciprocity with foreign countries if tariff revision could not be obtained. In this speech I referred to the necessity for wider markets for the cotton goods manufactured in North Carolina and the South. I referred to the retaliatory tariffs of Germany and other European countries and its effect upon the cottonseed-oil industry of the South. I referred to my former speech upon the treaty with France and the necessity of reciprocity with Germany to avoid retaliation. In that speech I said:

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a recent letter which was addressed to the Newbern Cotton Oil Mills, Newbern, N. C. That is my home town, and it is one of the best towns in the United States. [Applause.] In that letter the disastrous effect of the new German tariff upon the great commodity of cottonseed oil is shown. Do you know what that industry means to the South? Why, from the few hundred thousand dollars investment, this great industry—the cottonseed-oil industry—has been built up, until a few years ago, in 1902, the total value of the product was over \$42,000,000. Cottonseed-oil mills are scattered all over the South. They are located in close proximity to the ginneries, and the industry is constantly becoming of more and vital importance to the cotton-growing districts of the South. They afford new avenues of employment to the people and an opportunity for the investment of capital. What was formerly waste material is becoming a mine of wealth to the southern people. We find markets in France, Germany, and Austria-Hungary.

PLEA FOR THE SOUTHERN FARMER.

And now one, at least, of the industries in this great section of our country, which has so manfully wrought its salvation and prosperity, is threatened by your high protective tariff with almost total annihilation. For years we have been struggling to build up a great cottonseed oil industry, and from an investment of a few hundred thousand dollars this industry has invested in it many millions. The failure of the Republican Party to give us some relief by adopting, at least, reciprocity treaties with France and Germany and Austria, is destroying this great industry.

If you want to help us build up the South, and if you are not a sectional party, give us such legislation by treaty or act of Congress. Some revision of the tariff, either by act of Congress or reciprocity, will help counteract the drift toward monopoly and toward socialism. It will prevent a glut in the home market and build up commerce on land and sea and increase our revenues. Continue your policy of exclusion and favoritism and class legislation and it will inevitably bring upon you disaster and defeat. [Applause.]

Again, on February 5, 1908, at the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, in general debate, in speaking upon the subject of tariff revision, I again advocated reciprocity, if tariff revision could not be secured. In that speech I said:

But they say, Mr. Chairman, tariff revision is dangerous; that the Wilson bill produced a panic. Yes; the Wilson bill arises like Banquo's

ghost. You Republicans know that it would have produced ample revenue had it not been for the income-tax decision and that the panic which followed it was a banker's panic and produced by the money situation. You also know that the greatest panics of the country, in fact all except the panic of 1893, have been under Republican tariff laws and high protection, with a Republican President, and that cotton in the South touched its lowest prices under the McKinley law and a Republican administration, lower than under the Cleveland administration, and you know that this low price was 17 months after President McKinley's inauguration. You argue fallaciously. You deal in tirades against the Wilson bill, but you will do nothing for revision. The manufacturers' associations are appealing to you to-day in the capital city.

They have appealed to you in the past for better trade relations with foreign countries, to open up new foreign markets and enable them to extend their trade and to dispose of their surplus. McKinley pleaded with you in his last speech at Buffalo, just before he was stricken down by the assassin's hand, for reciprocity. Throw down the barriers of trade by a just tariff revision and reciprocal trade agreements with other countries. Open the ports of the United States to the trade of the world and cease your system of favoritism to special interests, and a wealth undreamed of will be the heritage of our children. Retaliation and commercial wars will cease, and the American merchantman's flag will again be seen upon every sea and in every port, and the United States, the most prosperous and intelligent Nation in the civilized world, will prosper as never before, and you will avoid commercial war, the growth of socialism, and strengthen your own party. Will you do it? I plead not as a partisan, but as a patriot, for your moderation and wisdom in this matter. If you fail to measure up to the occasion and your opportunity and responsibility, the American people will weigh your party once more in the balances and declare you wanting in statesmanship. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, on March 31, 1909, at the first session of the Sixty-first Congress, in my speech upon the Payne tariff bill, I advocated revision of the tariff and opposed the maximum and minimum provisions of the bill, insisting upon the principle of reciprocity instead of retaliation. In this speech I said:

I am unreservedly and strongly opposed and always have been to the maximum and minimum tariff features of this bill. I have time and time again upon the floor of this House appealed for reciprocity with foreign countries to give our farmers and manufacturers new and wider markets for the products of the farm and the mill. Reciprocity with foreign countries by mutual agreement and concessions was approved by Thomas Jefferson; it was also voiced by William McKinley in his last great speech at Buffalo before he was stricken down by an assassin's bullet. Reciprocity means mutual concession and agreement. A maximum and minimum tariff means retaliation and commercial war. Upon this subject in his Buffalo speech Mr. McKinley said:

"The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times. Measures of retaliation are not."

Your boasted constructive statesmanship must frame a more satisfactory bill than the Payne bill, or the avenging wrath of the people of the United States, both manufacturers and consumers, will be manifest, and the votes when counted at the fall election of 1910 will show that they have chosen a Democratic House of Representatives. [Applause.]

And now, after many years and much agitation, we find the Republican President advocating reciprocal trade agreements, forced to this position by the failure of the maximum and minimum provisions of the Payne tariff law and by the demand of the consumers of the country for lower prices and a lowering of the tariff walls, and by the repudiation of the Republican tariff law and the Republican Party at the polls last November. The truth is the Republican Party's position upon the subject of the tariff and of reciprocity as well has been one of deceit and hypocrisy. It advocated, first, a sham reciprocity in non-competing products. Second, it tried to fool the people with a sham revision of the tariff, revising it upward instead of downward by the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. Third, failing in these respects, the President and his party are forced to declare for further tariff revision, for a tariff commission, and, lastly, to allay the popular discontent, proposes the agreement with Canada which is the subject of the present bill. In negotiating and presenting this agreement to Congress the President is doubtless sincere, but the whole history of his party shows that its record upon the subject, both of the tariff and reciprocity, has been one of sham and pretense. The Republican Party in its platforms of 1892, 1896, 1900, and 1904 has indulged in glittering generalities upon the subject of reciprocity agreements.

The Democratic Party in its platforms of 1892 and 1904 has stood in plain terms for liberal trade arrangements to carry out the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer trade. The latest Democratic platforms upon this subject are as follows:

RECIPROCITY.

Democratic platform, 1892.

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while enacting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessities and comforts of life among our own people.

Democratic platform, 1904.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries, where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

THE HISTORY OF RECIPROCITY.

The commercial policy of the United States from the very infancy of the Government has been to encourage reciprocity and freedom of commerce with all nations willing to adopt a similar principle.

Mr. Jefferson declared 100 years ago that the choice was between reciprocity or retaliation. In the early history of the country, during the first administration of Washington, in 1793, Mr. Jefferson submitted a report presenting the conditions of our commerce of that day. Small as it was, the restrictions upon our trade and upon our vessels engaged in it were various and vexatious. In his report Mr. Jefferson recites these restrictions and asks the question, In what way can they best be removed, modified, or counteracted? He answers the question as follows:

As to commerce, two methods occur: First, by friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions existed; or, second, by legislation counteracting their efforts.

There can be no doubt but that of these two friendly arrangements are preferable with all who will come into them, and we should carry, said Jefferson, into such arrangements all the liberality and spirit of accommodation which the nature of the case will admit. France has, of her own accord, proposed negotiations for improving, by a new treaty on fair and equal principles, the commercial relations of the two countries. (Annals of 3d Cong., 1st sess.)

Early in the history of the country, also, the idea came into existence of reciprocity with Canada. From 1846 the idea was actively discussed and finally culminated in the Canadian reciprocity treaty of 1854. This agreement lasted for a period of 12 years, when it was finally overwhelmed by the rising tide of protectionism and the commercial jealousies and the political hostilities of the times. This is the statement made in the latest and best authority upon the subject of reciprocity by two distinguished professors of political economy, Laughlin and Willis, in their book upon "Reciprocity."

Much has been said in this debate to the discredit of our former treaty with Canada which is not justified by the facts. Before the abrogation of the treaty two special agents of the Government reported the operations of the treaty. They differed in their opinions, but in this difference of opinion it is well to examine the contemporaneous documents giving us the facts independent of partisan feeling. In the debates upon the subject some opposed and some advocated the treaty, but Mr. Taylor in his report made in 1860 sums up the general effect of the treaty up to the time of the Civil War as follows:

The practical results of this stipulation are unchanged since President Pierce congratulated the country in 1856. Successive Secretaries of the Treasury have been content to tabulate the progress of exports and imports under the reciprocity treaty, the balance of trade being always in favor of the United States.

In the latest and best authority upon reciprocity, Laughlin and Willis say that—

On the whole it must be conceded by every student of commercial intercourse that the Canadian treaty was well designed to promote the interests of our citizens and to put trade between the two countries upon an equitable basis. There is certainly nothing in the course of our aggregate trade statistics which would go to show that Canada was reaping an unusual advantage. The truth about the Canadian treaty may be summed up very briefly. Its abrogation was due primarily to political influences which had nothing whatever to do with commercial considerations; and secondarily to the dissatisfaction felt by certain special interests which found themselves oppressed by Canadian competition, forcing them to reduce prices to the consumer, where otherwise they would have found it easy to maintain them. Whatever truth there may be in the arguments concerning the progressive increase in Canadian duties and the attempt to prevent American vessels from doing their share of the carrying trade, there was certainly not enough of force in these considerations to lead to the abrogation of the treaty had special political influences been absent and had a few considerable interests not fancied themselves jeopardized by the continuance of reciprocity.

Since the abrogation of the treaty with Canada of 1854 efforts have been made to promote better commercial relations with Canada by means of the so-called Joint High Commission, which is still nominally in existence. This was a body appointed by the Governments of Canada and the United States to settle all points in dispute between the two countries, but up to date nothing has been accomplished in the way of better trade relations until the proposed bill. In regard to the workings and effect of this treaty I gather from the authority I have cited, Laughlin and Willis on "Reciprocity," and from other sources, that the agricultural interests were the very interests which profited immensely by the former treaty with Canada, and they were the principal opponents of the movement that finally succeeded in effecting its abrogation.

A continuous improvement in business conditions was reported on both sides of the border line until the Civil War interfered with commerce and an appeal to the anti-British sentiment of our people made by designing interests finally succeeded in securing the abrogation of the treaty. It was charged, with apparent truth, that the great transportation interests of this country helped to bring about the abrogation of the treaty in order to enjoy a monopoly of the freight from the West to the Atlantic seaboard. The abrogation of the treaty of 1854 has been regarded as injurious by practically all the students of our relations with Canada.

The next step in the history of reciprocity was under the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890. Under the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 a series of treaties were framed with a view to securing larger markets and reciprocal trade with Brazil and other countries, the President being authorized—

to suspend by proclamation the provisions of the McKinley Tariff Act relating to the free introduction of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, whenever he should be satisfied that the countries exporting such articles imposed upon the United States reciprocally unequal and unreasonable duties.

These treaties with South American countries, however, were regarded by the Democratic Party as sham reciprocity, pretending to establish closer trade relations and reciprocity in agricultural products chiefly, while the exorbitant and prohibitive tariff taxes upon manufactured articles were continued. The Democratic Party has been charged with an abandonment of its time-honored policy of reciprocity under the provisions of the Wilson bill. The provisions of the McKinley tariff law with reference to reciprocity were abrogated, but the Democratic theory was that the McKinley tariff law recognized the principle of retaliation, which was bad policy, and thereby countenanced the policy of other countries retaliating against our tariff duties.

The declaration in the Democratic platform of 1892 was directed against the pretense under which South American reciprocity had been worked up and against the failure to carry it further and against what had actually been done under the act. Then, too, the idea of retaliation in cases where reciprocity was not granted could not be regarded as consonant with Democratic principles in any view of the case. Such were the reasons given for the opposition to the reciprocity of the McKinley law by Democrats.

Mr. Wilson, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in his report upon the Wilson tariff bill, said:

It is the purpose of the present bill to repeal section 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890, commonly, but most erroneously, called its reciprocity provision. This section has brought no appreciable advantage to American exporters. It is not in intention or effect a provision for reciprocity, but for retaliation.

In the Senate, debating the repeal of the reciprocity provision of the McKinley law, Senator Vest stated the Democratic position on the subject in very clear language:

The Democratic Party, as I understand its position, has never been opposed to these reciprocal commercial arrangements. They were commenced or advocated originally by Mr. Jefferson, the founder of our party. But we are opposed irrevocably to that portion of section 3 of the McKinley Act which gives to the President of the United States the power of retaliation against foreign countries.

The Democratic position with reference to the reciprocity provision of the McKinley law of 1890 is further shown by the following extract from the Democratic Campaign Text Book of 1892, which shows that Democrats, in the platform of 1892 and in the report of the committee and the debate upon the Wilson tariff law of 1894, opposed sham reciprocity with South America, but favored reciprocity with Canada. I quote from the campaign book as follows:

Why are the Republicans so anxious to develop trade with South America and so hostile to trade with Canada?

The reason that the Republicans give is that some eggs and a little hay and a few horses come over the line into the United States, and so they tell the farmers of this country that they must be protected against Canadian competition. Look first at our Canadian trade as a whole. From 1873 down to the present time Canada has bought of us more every year than we have bought of Canada by several million dollars. Since 1882 the smallest balance in our favor was more than eleven and a half million dollars, and in four of those years it has exceeded \$19,000,000. In 1890, the year Mr. McKinley raised the fines imposed on people for the crime of dealing with Canada, our northern neighbor bought of us more than \$61,000,000 worth, and we bought of her less than \$40,000,000 worth. The balance of trade in our favor that year was \$22,274,090, and in 1891 the balance in our favor was \$19,905,523. The exports from this country to Canada in 1891 were worth more than all our exports to Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, Peru, and Ecuador put together.

Following the McKinley Act and the repeal of its provisions by the Wilson law came the Dingley tariff law, which provided, under sections 3 and 4, for the negotiation of reciprocity treaties. Section 3, however, like the reciprocity provision of the McKinley law, involved the same principle of retaliation, imposing duties upon certain articles, such as brandies, champagne, wines,

paintings, coffee, tea, and so forth, and providing for suspension of such duties in the event reciprocal and equivalent concessions may be secured in favor of the products and manufactures of the United States. Section 4 gave large authority to the President to negotiate trade agreements, both as to our agricultural products and manufactures. Under section 4 President McKinley appointed Mr. Kasson a special commissioner, and he negotiated treaties with the British and Danish colonies, Nicaragua and Ecuador and France. The French treaty applied to manufactures as well as agricultural products.

The United States was given the benefit of the French minimum tariff, and its ratification would have been of great benefit to the South and the whole country, but all these treaties were pigeonholed in the Senate on account of the opposition of New England interests.

RECIPROCITY A WISE POLICY.

Objection has been made to the reciprocity trade agreement with Canada upon the ground that either some special interest will be affected or because of some possible inequality in the trade, but, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER] in this debate—

in making a reciprocal trade agreement it takes two to make a bargain, and the agreement must, from the necessity of the case, contain concessions on the part of each of the parties.

No trade agreement can be made without some concessions apart from the principle involved. If we lose some trade, we gain other trade, and it is impossible to obtain all we would like.

Canada is our second best customer. Why not make her our first best? It has been said the farmers of the country would be affected injuriously. I can not see how this can apply to southern farmers; it seems to me southern farmers would be benefited. The Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out, with great force, new markets for our cottonseed oil, for our fruit, and other advantages under the treaty.

With our enormous exportations of farm products, the price thereof being fixed in the markets of the world, a tariff upon farm products is a mere delusion. Everybody knows that the tariff upon raw cotton would be of no advantage to the American farmer, because we are exporters and the price is fixed in the Liverpool market. As with cotton, so it is with corn, wheat, and other farm products. We export to all the world, including Canada, and being exporters, no tariff between this country and Canada affects the prices of farm products, while certainly for the products I have mentioned of the southern farmer we obtain the Canadian market free. The duty of 2 cents per pound upon berries is removed by the treaty. The duty upon vegetables is abolished, and also the duty of 17½ per cent imposed by the Canadian tariff upon southern cottonseed oil.

I have obtained from the Department of Commerce and Labor the following figures showing the large amount of exports from this country to Canada and to all the world, which I insert as a part of my remarks:

Exports of principal agricultural and farm products from the United States during the year ended June 30, 1910, and amounts of such exports going to Canada.

Class.	Total exports from the United States.	Total exports to Canada.
Animals:		
Cattle.....	\$12,200,154	\$323,274
Horses.....	4,081,157	3,216,318
All other animals.....	1,166,424	547,970
Breadstuffs:		
Barley.....	3,052,527	83,575
Corn.....	25,427,993	4,048,006
Oats.....	794,367	5,603
Wheat.....	47,806,598	2,317,191
Wheat flour.....	47,621,467	235,866
All other breadstuffs.....	7,488,378	601,466
Cotton, unmanufactured.....	450,447,243	8,936,006

In the debate much has been said about the failure of the Democrats to vote for the motion of Representative DALZELL (Republican), of Pennsylvania, to recommit the bill so as to provide for free meats and other articles. Everyone knows, as was repeatedly stated in the debate, that the trade agreement with Canada must stand or fall as a whole. Any amendment would necessarily defeat the bill. In making a bargain containing mutual concessions we can only obtain the greatest good to the greatest number, the greatest benefit with the least injury.

The purpose of the Dalzell amendment is clearly shown by the statement made in the Washington Star, a Republican paper. It was a mere subterfuge intended to defeat the whole measure, which sham the Democratic Party opposed. The statement,

which I think gives a correct view of the purpose of the Dalzell amendment, is as follows:

Had not the Democrats voted solidly against the apparently innocent motion of Representative DALZELL last night to recommit the reciprocity treaty bill with the free trade amendment, the death knell of the treaty would have been sounded then and there. This interesting fact developed to-day when it was learned that negotiations between this Government and Canada had been undertaken with a view to admitting and exporting fresh meats free and that Canada had refused. Therefore, had the bill been recommitted and amended in the seemingly innocent particular suggested by the crafty DALZELL, it would have been the end of the McCall bill.

The Democrats in their caucus on reciprocity considered the fresh-meats amendment, which Representative SERENO PAYNE and others had in interviews declared to be a harmless and necessary amendment. PAYNE and DALZELL had cited the fact that without free meats the trade agreement was open to the criticism that its meat specifications helped the packers and the cattle barons, but did nothing for the consumer. When this point was reached in the caucus, and it was suggested that the Democrats might properly support such a motion to recommit, Representative OSCAR UNDERWOOD stated that the President had informed him that this matter had been taken up with Canada already and that Canada had refused.

It can readily be seen what would have happened to the treaty had the Democrats swallowed the Dalzell bait and the treaty been amended in this form.

CONCLUSION.

Whatever may be the ultimate effect of the trade agreement should it finally be passed by this Congress, let it be understood further that it is not final. It is not in the nature of a treaty such as our former treaty with Canada of 1854. It is mere legislation subject to amendment or repeal at any future time, and subject also to the concurrent action of the Canadian Parliament. Indorsed by the Democratic Party in caucus, a step in the right direction of lowering the tariff walls, although recognized as containing imperfections, it would have been an unwise policy, in the opinion of all the leaders of the Democratic Party, to reject it and not to accept it for what it is worth, because it is in line with tariff reform, decreasing to some extent at least the burdens upon the consumers of the country imposed by the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, which the people repudiated by an overwhelming majority in the fall elections of 1910.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the Canadian reciprocity agreement is the greatest economic advance of our age. A century of freedom from war with Canada has almost obliterated the frontier line between us—a few years of commercial peace and good will will do the rest. Nature decreed that the currents of trade should flow back and forth from north to south, but with inconceivable stupidity man has tried to force those currents east and west along 3,000 miles of frontier. Rivers and mountains marked the trade routes from north to south, while politicians proclaimed that the laws of nature must be undone. We are now about to brush aside their foolish decrees.

Nothing has contributed more to the prosperity of the United States than freedom of trade between the States. Our neighbors from the north differ from us only in that they inhabit a less favored soil. They live the same lives we do, have the same ideals and ambitions, and were it not for the present tariff would be our closest friends. With the removal of this unnatural restraint commerce will leap forward with good will and enthusiasm both in Canada and the United States.

In tariff discussions experts are in the habit of depending too much on figures for their arguments, leaving out of account the human equation. This trade agreement will do more for the people of both countries than it is possible to calculate by arithmetic. The effect upon our mutual relations will be immense. We Americans are apt to assume that all nations take us at our own valuation of ourselves. That has not always been the case with Canada. Often she has looked upon us with anything but overwhelming affection.

The part in this aggravation caused by our clumsy and indefensible trade reprisals is enormous. If we remove these just grounds of complaint, the effect upon our relations with one another will be magical. Trade does not follow immutably the laws of economics. For instance, England will not buy of her near neighbor, Germany, when she can buy elsewhere, or, again, the Central Americans prefer the long trade route to Germany rather than the shorter one to us. Just so, Canadian commerce has not flourished as it should with its nearest neighbor on account of their suspicion of the Yankee. Upon the adoption of this proposed agreement we may expect an immediate increase in good will and in industrial activity on both sides of the line.

Members in this House may be heard to maintain that Canada receives more benefit from this agreement than does the United States. But gentlemen in Canada maintain with equal positiveness that the Yankee is getting the better of the trade. There are men in this country who even seem to resent the fact that Canada is to receive any benefit whatever from the arrangement. But what if it does increase the prosperity

of Canada? Is she not already our second customer? Let us enable her to buy more and make her our first.

An explanation of the strenuous opposition to this bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] is to be found in the complete interdependence of prohibitive tariff rates. These same gentlemen, for the same reason, will be found opposing with equal vigor a Democratic proposal to revise the tariff schedule by schedule instead of as an entirety. They recognize the fact that all defenders of prohibitive tariffs must hang together, or they will hang separately. The least breach in the wall will let in some light upon the subject, and is a menace to their long reign of economic conspiracy in the dark. Their course, however, does not commend itself to the country. Reform in our prohibitive tariff system is bound to come; at last the people are educated and will no longer tolerate the archaic stupidity of high tariffs? Why, then, do these "standpatters" refuse to yield an inch? Because they fear that the people will promptly take an ell? [Laughter.] They would be better advised if they could see, as we see, that the people are determined to have relief, and a wiser course on their part would be to yield a little in time rather than later on to lose all by opposition now.

The most respectable argument of the high protectionists has always been as to infant industries. There was a time in our history when that argument was entitled to consideration—not so to-day. The least respectable of their arguments, and that most mischievous in its results, has been in favor of protection of food products.

Representing, as I do, a city district in the most thickly populated area of the United States, my constituents, of course, are a unit for the passage of this bill. To them it brings a hope of a reduction of the high cost of living, so far as food is concerned. No great and immediate fall in the price of food is, however, to be expected in New York. The present importations from Canada of dairy products, eggs, and poultry are not large enough to effect any revolution in the prices of food here when admitted free. But gradually I expect to see the supply of those commodities, as well as of fish, greatly increased in the New York market; and with a large increase in the supply will come an inevitable drop in the market prices. Moreover, free trade in farm produce will prevent an attempt to corner the market on food. It will no longer be possible for a case-hardened speculator like Mr. Patten, of Chicago, to raise the price of bread to the poor. The Canadian supply would swamp his wheat corner in a moment.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will my colleague from New York kindly yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. BENNET of New York. For the reason my colleague has just given, would my colleague vote for an amendment to put beef, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other refrigerated meats on the free list?

Mr. HARRISON. In answer to that question I will ask my colleague another question: If he were in the next Congress, and we were to put all those articles on a bill, as we expect to do, would he vote for it? [Laughter.]

Mr. BENNET of New York. I will answer the question of the gentleman by saying that I will vote for them in this Congress, because we are now both present. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman may well feel free to say that, because if we did that the bill would be killed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not yield for a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, too, in times of agricultural depression here, a good crop in Canada may save the day. For example, in the event of a partial or total failure of the potato crop in Aroostook County, Me., or in Long Island, Canada might rush to the assistance of the people of our cities.

But the benefits to be expected by the consumers of our cities are too obvious to need any further discussion. It should be a matter of universal rejoicing that, at last, our stupid and indefensible economic system is to be reformed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The only concern in the minds of some gentlemen is the effect of this agreement upon the farmer and the fisherman. We hear complaints from representatives of granges that this law will ruin them; that they can not possibly compete with the much-dreaded Canadian. I am convinced that the great bulk of American farmers are afraid of no man—not even the Canadian. I am convinced that one Canadian farmer can not terrorize 12 American farmers when the facts are known. But it is not to be wondered at that some farmers are expressing alarm. It would be strange if they did not experience some apprehension

at the present moment. It would be, indeed, extraordinary if they did not feel indignant with the Republican Party, for which they have been voting all these years, now that the Republican Party has, to their way of thinking, stricken from around them the protective wall behind which they were comfortably ensconced. No wonder they now threaten to help the Democrats to pull down all other unholy and unnecessary duties on manufactured products; and I sincerely trust that they will. That is one of the most transcendent benefits to be expected from this legislation. But they will not turn tariff reformers for the reason they now assign; not for the purpose of "getting even" with Republican politicians; not because they are deprived of any protection, but because, in my judgment, they will soon discover that the whole agricultural schedule of the tariff, from A to Z, is a fake and always has been. They will not find themselves defenseless before the dreaded Canadian, but will discover to their amazement that Republican protection never protected them at all. And then, glory be, they will join with us in taking away prohibitive duties from all the other articles they use in everyday life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No wonder, indeed, that some farmers believe their existence depends upon the tariff, for a generation or more, in season and out of season, on the stump and off, on the rail fence and in the farmhouse, Republican agents of manufacturing interests have lectured them on the supposed advantages of their "protection," until at last some of them believe that the Canadian farmer is as much to be dreaded as the Huns and Vandals who swept down on imperial Rome and destroyed all civilization. But when our farmers find that their apprehensions were as empty air; when they find that they never received any protection whatever from the tariff, and that the United States, already the greatest granary the world has ever seen since the days of ancient Egypt, will be henceforth exporting to the formidable Canadian, then at last they will turn upon the false prophets of protection and help us to demolish their citadel—the high taxes on clothing and on manufactures.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from New York yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. In connection with the feeling on the part of the Grangers and Patrons of Husbandry, it was my privilege on Saturday evening last to attend a large meeting of the Patrons of Husbandry, who at that time were contemplating taking action contrary to that which is intended to be taken by the House committee having the matter in charge. When they fully understood the matter they decided that the farmer would be benefited by this proposed agreement, and not injured.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank my colleague for the suggestion, and I have no doubt the Grangers everywhere in the United States a year hence will be grateful for our having placed this law on the statute book.

To such an extent have the farmers been humbugged by delusive protection that they have been blind to the real meaning of our enormous exportations of wheat, corn, cattle, and cotton. In an era of unexampled prosperity they have believed that the tariff did it all. They have not realized that their high prices for farm products have been due partly to their own skill, energy, and intelligence, partly to our soil and climate, and partly to the drift of our population from the farms to the cities—factors which will remain unchanged even with free trade with Canada.

At present Canada exports about one-fiftieth the amount of grains exported by us. In many other important items her exports are negligible in comparison with our own. Especially are her exports to the United States negligible in comparison in each item with our total consumption. But, of course, our imports from Canada will undoubtedly increase when the duty is taken off. But not, in my opinion, to the detriment of the American farmer. He can take care of himself in competition with his neighbor to the northward, and especially when our advantages of location nearer to the great consuming markets are considered.

I have not entered upon a statement of the positive advantages offered to American farmers by this agreement. The Secretary of Agriculture has already done so with great force. He has pointed out the new markets for our cottonseed oil, for our fruit; the advantages of importation of seeds and of free barbed wire; the boon of reduced taxation on agricultural instruments. Our farmers know that Secretary Wilson is on guard night and day to protect their interests. They can believe him when he tells them that this trade agreement will, taken as a whole, be of direct and great benefit to the American farmer.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly; yes.

Mr. MADISON. I would like to inquire if the gentleman can not inform us to what extent barbed wire is manufactured in Canada, and the possible importation of it into this country. I ask the question in good faith for the purpose of securing information.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sorry that I can not give the gentleman the exact figures, but all the products of that character sold in Canada under their patents must be manufactured there under their patent laws, and such matters as harvesting and reaping machinery, cream separators, and the like are all manufactured there. On all agricultural implements duties are reduced by this bill.

But I am asked, Do I believe in lowering the prices paid to the American farmer for his produce? Certainly not. The American farmer, with few exceptions, is not to-day receiving more than his due—in many cases less. And, taking into consideration the extortionate prices he pays to the tariff-protected industries for his clothing, his farm implements, his household furniture, and building materials, I think the farmer is and always has been the worst sufferer from the whole tariff system—a yoke he voluntarily helped to put upon his own neck.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. HARRISON. I will yield just for a question.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Does the gentleman believe in putting a tariff of 50 cents a barrel on flour and taking the duty entirely off wheat?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe in taking the duty off flour also, but I will say as a Democrat that I am going to try to get all the relief I can from the Republican administration through this Canadian agreement, and then when we get into power we will offer you some of these bills to take the taxes off food and clothing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How, then, are we to reduce the price of food to the poor people of our cities without at the same time reducing the farmers' profits? I can best answer that by an illustration which appeared in the testimony recently taken before our committee. A representative of the farming interests of Jefferson County, N. Y., stated that the farmers of that section received to-day about 3 cents a quart for their milk, while the same milk usually sells in New York City for 9 cents a quart. The same story was told by the Representative of the Indiana farmer as to Indiana milk which sells in Chicago. The farmer is not making a fraction of a cent profit at 3 cents a quart, but the people of the East Side of New York can scarcely afford to buy his milk. No wonder the cost of living is high! The prices are held up by combinations of middle men who extort the last penny of the poor. To such a situation as that the Canadian markets will administer relief. If we can greatly increase our supply of food products we can fight at least on even terms with the middle man. Right here in the city of Washington such prices are exacted from the consumer by the butchers and grocers as would strike the farmers dumb with amazement. There is said to be a trust here among the provision men more tyrannical than the Pharaoh who cornered the corn market of old. Every city in our country has the like.

Before the Committee on Ways and Means the strongest opposition to this treaty came from the fishermen from Gloucester. That famous old port sent some of the bravest and the best of its sea captains down here to tell us that free fish from Canada would ruin their industry. To be sure, they were unable to state to the committee the price of fish in the Boston market and the price of fish in the provincial market from which they feared ruinous competition, but they were certain upon general protection principles that they would be ruined. Many of these captains are Canadians now; most of the crews are Canadians now; much of the business is also carried on by hiring Canadians on the banks to catch the fish for the American vessels—payment being made for the amount of fish caught instead of by the day's work.

Even if, to the few Americans engaged in this arduous occupation, competition should prove too much, we may surely be permitted to offset the inestimable boon of cheaper fish in all the markets of our North Atlantic coast. As for Gloucester, under a protective tariff on fish the industry is now on its last legs; on the other hand, during the last reciprocity treaty with Canada, under free fish, the Gloucester fishing fleet was three times the size it is to-day in a protected market. We may look forward with confidence to a renewal of the economic prosperity of Gloucester under free fish again. She is destined to become the greatest center of fish packing and distributing on our coast under this new era of unrestricted commerce. Should this

prophecy not be fulfilled, it will be because Boston has displaced Gloucester for causes entirely disconnected with Canada and Canadian tariffs.

At all events, the Gloucester fisherman is offered some inducements by this agreement in return for the free-fish privileges. The license tax exacted by the Canadian Government is reduced to merely nominal proportions, and, in apparent good faith, it is made to appear that the licenses will be continued indefinitely in the future.

The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand by the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city of the East they cry out to you for relief. No tax is so dangerous as a tax upon the table of the poor. No tax is so indefensible as a levy upon the hunger of mankind. If it lies within our power, as I believe it now does, to bring relief to future generations who may feel the pinch of hunger and of want, every Member in either party, from every section of our country, should unite to make this a law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Before the gentleman takes his seat, will he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. He being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I desire to ask him this question on this subject. The bill is drawn in two parts, one referring to the items to be put upon the free list and the other to the items on which like rates are to be attached by the two Governments. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York and receive an answer from him as to whether it would not be entirely possible, if we were to pass this trade agreement, for the Canadian Parliament to accept this first provision as to the modification of rates in the first paragraph and refuse to accept the others, or vice versa?

Mr. HARRISON. No. I think the gentleman from South Dakota is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I think the reading of it will sustain the propriety of my suggestion.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and any foreign country the discussion is very apt to lose sight of two important factors. First, that it takes two to make a bargain, and the agreement must, from the necessities of the case, contain concessions on the part of each of the contracting parties; and, second, that the bargain when made applies with equal force and effect and extends to every part of the countries affected.

It goes without saying that if the commissioners on the part of the Government of the United States had been able to draw the pending agreement without reference to the wishes, desires, or demands of the Canadian commissioners a different instrument would have resulted. And, similarly, the Canadian Government was unable to get everything it desired because of the conflicting demands presented by the representatives of the United States.

Again, while many features of the agreement reached by the parties will work injury, at least temporary, and possible injustice to some particular sections of each country, if the common good of the entire people of either country is subserved by the agreement as a whole, it is the part of statesmanship for the Government of the country so affected to disregard the local or sectional disadvantages and injuries and consider only the total net result of the contract.

It can serve no useful purpose, therefore, to dig into the details of the agreement and expose to view only those instances where our own Government was compelled to make concessions to the other party to the contract, or where, in the negotiation of the treaty, the particular interest of one section is submerged beneath the common benefit. A better judgment will be reached if we take a broad view of the contract and deal in general terms rather than with particular items, or consider only those articles produced or manufactured in the respective countries in which the trade between the United States and Canada is large and extensive, and treat as comparatively negligible quantities those articles in which the trade is small or uncertain.

Let us for a moment, then, take such a general view of the agreement. Nearly 600 articles are covered by the contract, and

in a broad and general way the terms of the agreement made are comprised within this summary:

1. Reciprocal free lists on leading primary food products, such as wheat and other grains, dairy products, fresh fruits and vegetables, fish of all kinds, eggs and poultry, cattle, sheep, and other live animals.

2. Mutually reduced rates on secondary food products, such as fresh meats, canned meats, bacon and hams, lard and lard compounds, canned vegetables, flour, cereal preparations, and other foodstuffs partially manufactured.

3. Certain commodities now free in one country are to be made free by the other, such as cotton-seed oil by Canada and rough lumber by the United States. Print paper is to become free on the removal of all restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood.

4. Certain commodities now having different rates of duty are reduced by the country maintaining the larger rate to the lower rate. Thus plows, harvesters, thrashing machines, and drills are reduced by Canada to the United States rate, while Canada reduces the duty on coal to the United States rate of 45 cents a ton and the United States reduces the duty on iron ore to 10 cents per ton and lowers the rate on dressed lumber.

It should be noted that the United States already possesses a larger field in the markets of Canada than any other country, the Canadian imports from the United States for the fiscal year 1910 amounting to \$223,501,809, out of a total of Canadian imports from all countries of \$375,833,016, the nearest competitor of the United States being Great Britain, with a total of imports of \$95,350,300.

On the other hand, the United States is not the principal market for Canadian exports, Great Britain exceeding the United States in the value of such imports from Canada by some \$35,000,000. In the year mentioned Canada exported to the United States goods to the value of \$104,199,675, and to Great Britain \$139,482,945, these two countries receiving by far the larger amount of the Canadian exports, which totaled to all countries \$279,247,551.

The proposed tariff agreement, referring, as it does, to something less than 600 articles, including all items mentioned or referred to, affected by the agreement, does not, of course, affect all of the trade between the two countries. The total value of articles imported into Canada from the United States affected by the proposed agreement is \$47,827,959, only 20 per cent of the present total imports into Canada, while the total value of articles imported into the United States from Canada which will be affected by the proposed agreement is \$47,333,158, or 48 per cent of the total value of Canadian imports into the United States. As the effect of all the changes in the tariff laws of the two countries which will be made when this agreement is put into force is in the nature of a reduction of duty and a lowering of the tariff wall, it must be apparent at once that, so far as that reduction will result in a decrease of prices to the ultimate consumer, the United States has the advantage in the arrangement, for the proportion of its imports affected by the agreement is approximately two and one-half times as great as the proportion of Canadian imports affected by it. The converse of the proposition must also be true, that, so far as the reduction of duties will decrease the profits of the American producer, the United States will be more seriously affected relatively than Canada.

It seems plain, therefore, that the agreement is of greater benefit to the great American consuming public than to the particular interests engaged in the production of the articles affected by the agreement. Every person in the country is a consumer and directly or indirectly affected by the proposed change. While it is also true that practically every person may be said to be in the producing class, it does not follow that every such person is affected either directly or indirectly by a change in the revenue laws covering so small a number of items.

Now, let us see what class of producers are most affected by the agreement, and in the discussion of this question we are bound to meet, even if we can not answer successfully, every objection urged against the bill. No consumer, unless he be also in the class of producer affected by the measure, is complaining against it, and, it seems to me, that even the producing classes, when the agreement is analyzed, will be shown to have no such serious cause of complaint, when considered as a whole, as a few of the affected interests by recent agitation have endeavored to make the country believe.

The articles included, under the agreement, imported into the United States from Canada—taking the year ended June 30, 1910, as a basis—to the value of more than \$200,000, which now come under the free list, are:

Horses and mules, sheep, oats, dried pease, hay, fresh vegetables, berries, dairy products, flaxseed, grass seed, fish of all kinds, sawed lumber, gypsum, mica, asbestos, coke, pulp wood, and paper, the largest items, by far, being fish of all kinds and lumber, against the reduction of which, it seems to me, that the howls of the stricken lumber trust or the plaintive cries of the worshippers of Massachusetts' sacred cod should not prevail when contrasted with the welcoming shout of the home builder and home maker, to whom the comforts of life will be brought within nearer reach by this proposed legislation. [Applause.]

Articles included under the agreement imported into the United States from Canada on which there is a mutual reduction to a reciprocal rate, which exceed in value \$200,000 annually, are wheat flour and bran. The articles included under the agreement imported into the United States from Canada, in which this country makes a special reduced tariff rate, exceeding in annual value the sum of \$200,000, are aluminum, crude and manufactured, laths, shingles, sawed lumber, and coal, slack and culm.

Articles included under the agreement imported into Canada from the United States of the annual value of more than \$200,000, which now go on the free list, are as follows:

Horses, maize (not for distillation), fresh vegetables, berries, dried fruits, cottonseed oil, clover and timothy seed, garden seeds, shelled oysters, sawed lumber, cream separators, galvanized iron or steel wire, typesetting machines, barbed fencing wire, coke, wire rods, and print paper.

Articles included under the agreement, imported into Canada from the United States in 1910, exceeding in value \$200,000, in which there is a mutually reduced reciprocal rate, are as follows:

Bacon and hams, pork, lard, prepared cereal foods, bran, farm wagons and farm implements, portable engines, clocks, watches, etc., automobiles and their parts, fancy leather goods.

The only article imported into Canada from the United States on which Canada reduces her tariff to the American rate, exceeding in value \$200,000, is coal.

Of all these, by far the largest item is coal, while other large items are maize, fresh vegetables, sawed lumber, manufactures of steel and iron and coke, dressed meats, lard, portable engines, and automobiles.

It will thus be seen that many manufactured articles, the product of the United States, will find a wider market with its consequent stimulant to business activity here; and while it may be possible that the Canadian market for farm products will be enlarged, increasing the competition of the American farmer in his home market, it is not so generally true of the articles which he produces as to be a serious injury to the farmer as a class. And whatever injury it may accomplish must sink into the realm of the negligible when contrasted with the benefit which will result to the great body of consumers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman assume that any injury would be done to the farmer by the ratification of this treaty?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. It is possible that particular farmers, engaged in particular lines, or raising particular products in some sections, might be seriously affected by it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is a fact, are we not giving something away that we might just as well hold for the benefit of the farmers of this country?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. You can not draw an agreement of this kind between the United States and any foreign country, making concessions on either side, which will be advantageous to every living soul in both countries. It is the common good that we must consider in every pact of this kind. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague yield for one more question?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If it is the common good we seek to conserve by an agreement of this kind, and there is an injury to any section of the country or to any class of its citizens, would not that be a common injury?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. It certainly would not, according to my understanding of the word "common." We must consider all four corners of this country in writing a tariff agreement between this country and any other, and it might be very likely that it would be impossible to secure such concessions as would result in advantages to all our people everywhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But if we reduce the purchasing power of the farmer, do we not also reduce the purchasing power of the man in the city?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. Oh, well, that is going into another excursion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am speaking now of the common effect to which the gentleman is applying his remarks.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I think I have answered the gentleman's inquiry. In many cases the agreement will be found to be a real benefit to the farmer. Take, as an instance, the item of fresh vegetables, and there are many others in the same situation. Canada in 1910 received of such vegetables from the United States \$865,563 worth, while the United States received from Canada of the same general class of articles \$682,455. In other words, despite the fact that the Canadian rate on these vegetables is higher than the American rate, nearly \$200,000 more in value of such articles found their way from the United States into Canada than in the other direction. It must be perfectly plain that with the adjustment of these rates to a reciprocal basis, the Canadian field will be opened up more widely to the American producer, and if the Canadian can not, under the present tariffs, which are favorable to him, ship as many goods to the United States as we export to Canada, he certainly can not seriously compete in our market with the producer of these goods when the difference in rate is removed.

The same thing is true as to berries and dried fruits of all kinds, cottonseed oil, clover and timothy seed, all kinds of garden seeds, and shelled oysters. As to some of these articles, there is little or no production in Canada, and as to some others it is possible that the condition which I describe is caused by the difference in the seasons, the products of Canada coming to maturity later than those of the United States. Still, as these are conditions which will not be changed by the proposed agreement, it may safely be laid down as a general proposition that in all cases where there is mutual trade in the same general class of articles, and the rate heretofore has been more favorable to the Canadian exporter than to the United States exporter, but the balance of trade has been in favor of the United States, the reduction of the rates to a reciprocal rate will result in largely increasing that balance in favor of this country. While it is true that the market in this country is much larger than in Canada, the amount of Canadian exports will be fixed not alone by the consumption here, but by the production at home, and the relative production and consumption of the two countries can not and will not be changed by the present agreement. Consequently, we are bound to judge the future by the results of the past interchange of commodities between the two countries.

There are two methods of approaching the consideration of the proposed tariff agreement with Canada, and, according as we choose our path to that consideration, our conclusion will be for or against it. If we travel along the broad road, which is bounded by the common welfare of all the people of the United States, considering always the greatest good to the greatest number, we can not help but reach the conclusion that this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Would not the common good, for the whole country, suggest that if we are to have closer trade relations with Canada they ought to go all down the line, and not be confined to farm products, but be extended also to the products of manufacturers?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. The gentleman is one of those who fails to consider the agreement in the light of the fact that there are two parties to the contract, and that the interests of all the people of both countries must be considered in drawing it. If we had the drafting of it ourselves alone, we would not put anything into it that would hurt anybody in the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I suppose Canada would not object to free meat products from the packing houses and free flour from the mills.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I can not speak for Canada.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Would not those items be of considerable importance to the people of this country?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I myself would not object, but would welcome such an interchange. If, on the other hand, we seek the narrow path which winds in and out amongst the selfish interests of the constituents of each particular Member, each of us can find somewhere in the bill some provision which can persuade our minds that some interest in our own district may be injuriously affected, and if that be the controlling factor in our consideration of the bill we will be led to oppose it. Right here, by the way, is the difference between the operation of the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue only and the Republican doctrine of a tariff for protection. The one considers first the needs of the Government and then the welfare of all the people; the other considers the needs of the protected industries of the country and then the prosperity of particular

sections and classes of the people. In this fundamental distinction is found the reason for the practical unanimity of the Democratic Party in this House in favor of the bill and the wide divisions of the Republican majority, some of whom, where the interests of their own districts are little affected, give it a half-hearted support, while others, with eyes that see not beyond the voters at home, refuse to lend it their aid.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has distinguished between the Republican policy of protection and the policy in which he believes—a tariff for revenue only. The gentleman has made an eloquent address which pertains to the treaty or agreement which proposes to reduce the revenues of the United States in its commercial dealings with Canada. I would like to ask the gentleman how he harmonizes his proposed tariff for revenue with the proposition to establish free trade with a neighboring country, by which we will receive no tariff.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. The Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue does not necessarily, as we on this side understand it, mean that there must be a tariff levied on every article that will raise revenue, or raise the most revenue; but we make the necessities of life, under the authority of precedents of Democrats for 75 years, an exception to the proposition that imports must raise revenue. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand it to be the policy of the gentleman and his party to levy duty upon a certain class of articles sufficient to conduct this Government?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. We propose to levy such customs duties as will raise as much at least—and, I may say, unquestionably more—than the Republican Party, through its present tariff law, has been able to raise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To that extent the gentleman is a protectionist.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I am not a protectionist to any extent, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows it perfectly well.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the tariff is removed to the extent the gentleman suggests, how does he propose to raise sufficient revenue to run the Government?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. The gentleman makes a most fundamental mistake that many people throughout the country with less intelligence than he also make, and that is that it does not mean necessarily that by writing a high tariff law you increase the revenue, but probably the contrary is true, and can be proven to be true. We can write a law revising the entire tariff from A to Z, reducing the tariff in many important particulars, and raise 75 per cent more revenue than the Republicans raise under the present law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman is a tariff man.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. The Member of Congress who considers his personal political fortunes above his country's good will vote against this bill; and, though he may be persuaded that he does it out of deference to the selfish wishes of the people of the particular district which he represents, he knows in his heart that such a reason would not be sufficient for him to oppose the general benefit if his own fortunes were not involved in the issue.

On the other hand, the man who will disregard the cries for continued favors from some of the people amongst his own constituency and listen to the demands of the country as a whole for relief from the effects of obnoxious tariff legislation will vote for the bill.

Men still remark upon the growth and development of the attributes of the statesmen in the last years of the life of President McKinley. Though the author of the bill which made him known as the foremost champion of the protective theory, and caused the beneficiaries of his law to hail him as the advance agent of their prosperity, his last message to the American people, when standing almost within the shadow of the crime which removed him from the scene of earthly activities, indicated a developing breadth of view that marked him as a statesman. If the same development in statesmanlike qualities had obtained in those who followed him in the direction of his party's economic policy his last advice in his Buffalo speech would have been crystallized into law before 10 years had passed from the time of its utterance. Listen to his words:

A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities—a mutual exchange—is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade.

We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

The present Executive in his last official deliverance in respect to tariff legislation, the message transmitting the trade agreement to Congress, rises nearer to the broad heights of statesmanship in advocating its passage than has any other Republican leader in the past decade. His words sound like an echo of the last speech of McKinley, when he says:

The guiding motive in seeking adjustment of trade relations between two countries so situated geographically should be to give play to productive forces as far as practicable, regardless of political boundaries. While equivalency should be sought in an arrangement of this character, an exact balance of financial gain is neither imperative nor attainable. No yardstick can measure the benefits to the two peoples of this freer commercial intercourse and no trade agreement should be judged wholly by customhouse statistics.

I desire to advert for a moment to what we might call the political aspect of the situation, which is presented by this proposed legislation. The agreement was of necessity negotiated by the executive branch of the Government, and it was only after it had been agreed to by the commissioners, acting for the respective Governments, that its contents became known by Members of Congress. Whether it be from pride of parentage or from an honest desire to relieve the people from some of the oppressive burdens of the Payne-Aldrich law, the President seems sincerely interested in the enactment of a law to carry the treaty into effect, and if current reports are to be believed strong intimations have come from the Executive that unless the present Congress enacts this law an extraordinary session of the Sixty-second Congress will be called, to which the treaty will be again submitted. While this is doubtless intended as an argument for the passage of the bill, I am bound to say that if I thought the President would go as far as the newspaper intimations indicate I would welcome the failure of the bill at this time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Strong as we are on this side of the Chamber for reciprocity with Canada along the lines of the proposed agreement, and sincere as we are in favor of the passage of the McCall bill to carry it into effect, the postponement of its passage would not be an unmixed evil if it brought with it an earlier opportunity than would otherwise be presented to Congress to make sweeping and drastic changes in many of the schedules of the Payne-Aldrich law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We welcome this bill as a step in the right direction [applause], and we are prepared to vote for it on that account; but we should welcome also the opportunity which an extraordinary session of the next Congress would present of stretching out that step in the same direction until it reaches nearer to the goal of our desires. If ever there was an election result the meaning of which could be read with accuracy it was that of the election of 1910. The people spoke in no uncertain tones for a thorough revision of the recently enacted tariff law, and nothing but the limitations of the law, or the refusal of the President to bow to the popular will, which will keep the next Congress chafing at the bit until December, prevents the Democratic Party from going as far as their power permits to enact the people's will into the statute law of the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Some members of our own party have hesitated to support this measure, because it comes from a Republican source, and some comment has been heard in the country to the effect that the Democratic Party in the House, by falling in line for a Republican measure of this sort, has made itself only the tail to the Republican kite.

In the first place, I am not at all sure it is a Republican measure. It has reached its present stage only because its sponsors were forced to take some action in answer to the popular demand expressed at the last election in the return of a Democratic Congress. It is a belated acknowledgment of the disappointment of the country in the Payne bill. It is a forced confession that that law did not and will not accomplish the purposes which a clear majority of the American people demand, and it is hoped that the present proposition may prove a stop-gap between the law, which the Republican Party wants but dares not defend, and the Democratic law, which the people want and their representatives will enact. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As far as I am concerned, I do not consider the beginning of tariff legislation. I prefer to consider its end.

Wherever such legislation comes from, if I can square it with the creed of my party, as I understand it, I shall support it, and if I can not, whether it comes from Democratic or Republican sources, I shall oppose it.

Mr. FASSETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. FASSETT. If I understand the gentleman's proposition, it is that this treaty or compact or proposed legislation does, so far as it can, square with Democratic doctrine.

Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER. I have said that it is a step in the right direction, in the direction we want to travel. [Applause.]

If the critics of the Democratic position would for a moment leave the agreement itself out of consideration and consider only the concrete piece of legislation with which we are called upon to deal, their criticism would answer itself. We are considering a tariff bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts and which, though entitled "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," might well be entitled "A bill to reduce many of the duties levied under the act of August 6, 1909;" that law we have condemned in every gathering of the people between the seas. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In language strong and vehement, but with strict regard for truth, we have pronounced it the worst piece of tariff legislation in the history of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people have no less vehemently responded. Intrusted with the power to amend it so as to make some of its provisions less obnoxious, and confronting the opportunity to write our denunciations into practicable results on the statute books, every consideration of honor and honesty requires that we shall not flinch. In the next Congress we would pass this law as a matter of course, but we would also pass other tariff legislation accomplishing a general reduction of the duties levied under the act of 1909, which would apply the acid test to the protestations of certain factions of the Republican Party, whose members have been clamoring in voices that have stirred the country for a reduction of tariff taxes, and would put the same test on the good faith of certain declarations of the President himself, whose criticism of some of the schedules of the Payne law has been more mild than our own, only because restrained to some extent by his responsibility for it. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELL having taken the Chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 32473) for the relief of the sufferers from famine in China, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. BULKELEY, and Mr. TALLAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this Republican House of Representatives may, with Democratic assistance, pass this bill in haste; but, if so, it will repent it at its leisure. It is scarcely 18 days, including Sundays, since this message was sent to the House for consideration and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I have read the various hearings, if they can be called such, had before that body, and I think it is safe to say that never in the history of tariff or kindred legislation has any bill of like magnitude and involving so important commercial policies to this country been disposed of with such unseemly haste and almost total lack of investigation of the fundamental principles involved and with such lack of information to assist Members in reaching a conclusion as to whether or not from the standpoint of the good of the entire country this legislation ought to be indorsed. The fact has been brought out here, and the hearings will show, that not a single person on behalf of the administration in any way engaged in the preparation of this so-called tentative agreement has been called to testify as to its various provisions, and that no one in behalf of the administration has explained why certain concessions were made and certain others were not demanded.

Other evidences of inadequate consideration have been apparent in this preliminary discussion to-day, when it has been made to appear that thus far no member of the Ways and Means Committee has undertaken to inform this Committee of the Whole as to the meaning of some vital and important provisions or explain what would be the effect of having them in the law. I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] when he was reading for the edification of this committee from a prepared document in the form of remarks, whether or not if we passed this bill it would not be entirely optional with the Canadian Parliament to accept the provisions by which we propose to put certain articles on the free list and take no action on the other schedule, and whether the effect of that would not be inevitably to place those articles upon the free list and make no reduction whatever in the lists which are still to retain some tariff, and he pooh-poohed the idea and said it was impossible. Yet, I challenge any lawyer of this House on either side of the Chamber to read the bill and undertake to defend the conclusion reached by the gentleman from New York, a member of the Ways and Means Committee. It is absolutely optional, if we pass this bill in its present form, for Canada to accept the free-trade provisions and take no action whatever upon the other schedules. Upon page 15 begins the legislation regarding articles to be placed upon the free list, and it provides that the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs—

The growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States—

shall be exempt from duty; and then there follows the free list as set forth in Exhibit A in the President's message to this body. Upon page 20 occurs the proviso under which these articles are to be put upon the free list:

Provided, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the following articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States or any of its possessions are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty.

And then follows merely a repetition of the free list, and all that is necessary for Canada to get the full benefit of importing her food and other products that are placed on the free list into this country, without taking any action whatever on the proposed tariff items, is simply to legislate admitting the same articles free of duty when imported from the United States into Canada. Likewise with the items that are to be subjected to certain reductions, beginning on page 1 of this bill, there is no condition attached as to when these reductions shall take effect, other than that they shall go into effect when the President shall make proclamation that the Canadian Government has made the same reductions on these articles in the Canadian tariff.

There is nothing in this bill that says that Canada shall not accept a part of this agreement and not accept the rest, and if we pass the bill in that form inevitably the option is with the Canadian Parliament to accept one half of this proposition and ignore the other half.

The further fact that this bill has not been sufficiently digested has, I think, been demonstrated to this House when questions have been asked members of the Committee on Ways and Means as to the wood-pulp proposition. No one has undertaken to explain what would be the effect of this amendment that the committee has made.

We are led to believe that this tentative agreement is a sacred document not to be amended, and yet the Committee on Ways and Means has seen fit to offer an amendment upon the wood pulp and print paper provision, and yet no member of the Ways and Means Committee has undertaken to suggest—and I very much doubt whether one will—or to explain to this House what will be the effect of the amendment proposed on trade relations in wood pulp and print paper between these two countries. That task is left to our honored friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whom we all concede is an expert upon this subject, but I think that any man who will read and study this question will at least see some very inequitable provisions in it.

The truth is the newspaper fraternity are to be handed a "gold brick" in this wood pulp and print paper proposition. It sounds loud, but when analyzed it contains no substantial concession to the consumers of wood pulp or print paper in the United States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the gentleman from South Dakota permit me one question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will yield for one question. I would like to yield for many, but I have but 15 minutes and I am admonished that already 10 minutes of that time has elapsed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Adverting to the paragraph on page 20 of the bill, is not it true that if this bill is enacted into law in its present form every article mentioned in the bill, both those provided in the free list and those upon which the tariff is reduced, will be admitted in this country free of duty whenever Canada adopts the free list provided in the latter portion of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I have already stated—no, the free list will be admitted into this country whenever Canada accepts our free list and the tariff list will be admitted into this country when Canada adopts a like tariff list.

Mr. POINDEXTER. How does the gentleman escape the conclusion from this language?

Provided, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty.

That includes every article in the bill from the first page down to the twentieth—"the articles above enumerated."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Because that is simply a proviso as to the free-list section of the bill, beginning on page 15.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does not say so.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There are two provisions. There is a list of the tariff items in the bill further back, beginning on page 1. The gentleman will find that absolutely correct.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think so.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Now, I oppose this bill in this form, and in doing so I want it distinctly understood I am not one who is not in favor of Canadian reciprocity. I believe in the protective principle, but I believe in a lowering of the duties also to a point which represents the difference in cost in production at home and abroad. As Republicans we have for the first time in our national platform, three years ago, given a scientific definition as to what ought to be the extent of the application of the American protective principle in this language, practically—the difference in cost of production here and elsewhere, with a fair profit added. I oppose this legislation because we are not informed, and no effort has been made to inform us as to whether any item of this bill measures up to this Republican standard, the standard we seek to apply. It seems to me, as I look this over, that there is evidence that everything that Canada wants from this proposed trade arrangement she had obtained. If there is anything which she desired that has not been yielded to her, it is not apparent. There are certain things we very much need in this country, and one of them is free wood pulp absolutely. We were given in the Payne tariff bill free wood pulp from wood cut on private lands.

We get nothing more as to wood pulp in this proposed agreement if it should be passed. We very much need free wood pulp from the Crown lands and public lands owned by the Provinces. That must be the main source of supply. Canada very discreetly and shrewdly suggests that they have no control over that, and that they have neither desire nor power to change the policies of the Provinces upon that subject. If these Provinces see fit to give what we so much desire, that might be done, otherwise not. We should withhold our concessions until we can obtain this concession and others that would be a real gain in our commercial relations. It is like the barley schedule and the wheat schedule, where our representatives, if we could find who they are, might with the same propriety have said, "We will consent to free wheat and free barley introduced into this country whenever North Dakota and South Dakota and Minnesota consent to it, but we have neither desire nor power to force them to do so." In other words, we are obtaining nothing from this bill that has yet been pointed out and nothing I have been able to find of practical advantage to this country in our trade relations. I oppose it, furthermore, because it is class legislation. It is only another one of those tendencies which would place further special privileges in the hands of intermediaries between the producer and the consumer of our food products. If the champions of this bill think that 10,000,000 farmers in these United States are not smart enough to discover the iniquity of this measure and are not bold and independent enough to assert themselves upon this subject, they have something coming in the way of a revelation. A great deal has already been heard in the last few days. I oppose any legislation which undertakes to place the products of the farmer upon the free list, and the moment they get out of his hands into the hands of the packer, or miller, or tanner, would place a liberal protection upon them, so that the farmer, himself, if he wants to buy some of his own products in changed form for his own consumption, must first pay a price increased by a protective tariff.

My Republican friends, if we adopt this, it is the beginning of the end of the Republican doctrine of protection to American industries [applause on the Republican side], and it will be the end unless we have another political revolution that shall fol-

low the Democratic tariff revision like the revolution following the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We can upon no industrial or commercial principle justify the placing of the products of the farmer upon the free list, leaving him an absolutely free-trade market in which to sell the products of his own hands and toil, and then force him into a protective market for practically everything he must buy. A policy so manifestly unfair will not withstand the test of time and will rise up to embarrass whatever political party may be responsible for this injustice. [Applause.]

The ultimate consumer is likely to be disappointed with the results of this legislation. The farmer will be forced to sell his products at reduced rates, but very little of the reduction will filter through to the consumer. We reduced print paper \$2.25 per ton in the Payne Act, but the paper companies appropriated the reduction and print paper is higher to the newspapers than it was before the tariff reduction was made.

Secretary Wilson has made a thorough investigation of the cost of food supplies and reports that the farmer is receiving only a fair profit on his investment, but that the middle men and corporations handling the food supply add, on the average, about 50 per cent to the original cost. The intermediaries are well organized and ready to take over to themselves any reduction on the first cost of farm products that may come by reason of free trade in these articles with Canada.

I am not unfriendly to genuine reciprocity with Canada. I have often said that I would like to see Canada annexed to the United States. Her people and our own are of kindred blood and have a common history and common ideals. I should like to see much closer trade relations with our northern neighbor. Indeed, I am willing to take up our tariff wall altogether and place it down on the northern boundary of Canada. But when we commence on this policy we must go all the way down the line, treating all American industries alike. Reciprocity with Canada must not be purchased at the cost of reciprocity in the United States. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 7252) granting an annuity to John R. Kissinger.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 31922. An act to authorize the Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Co. to build a dam across the New River near Foster Falls, Wythe County, Va.; and

H. R. 31860. An act permitting the building of a wagon and trolley car bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bills of the following titles:

S. 10326. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10454. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10453. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10327. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 31538. An act to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENDALL].

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit an observation or two upon this proposition, not as respects its specific details, but as concerns its general aspects. I am not unaware that any opposition that may be interposed to this bill will be

unavailing, but I should be recreant to the great party with which I have been affiliated all my life, and faithless to the great constituency which has commissioned me to represent it on this floor, if I remained silent at this hour. It requires no prophet's vision to discern that this measure is to receive favorable consideration in this House. It is supported by a minority of Republicans who appear anxious to imitate the Democratic Party [applause on the Republican side], and by a majority of Democrats who are determined to destroy the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] That coalition, as incongruous as it is mischievous, is too powerful to be overthrown. But, Mr. Chairman, I protest against this bill not alone because it is unfair, unjust, and inequitable, but because its enactment marks the beginning of the end of the policy of protection to American industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That policy is the policy advanced by Lincoln, expounded by Blaine, and defended by McKinley. It is so distinctively a Republican policy that if our party does not represent the principle upon which it is bottomed that party has no excuse for continued existence in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is a policy which has encountered violent enemies always, but always it has commanded devoted defenders. It is a policy which is now reviled by the false testimony of foes and compromised by the faint praise of friends, but I believe it is still worthy of allegiance, no matter how severely it may be attacked from without nor how supinely it may be abandoned from within. It is a policy which has vindicated itself in the history of the Republic. It is a policy under which our country in 50 years has increased from 30,000,000 to 90,000,000 in population and from eighteen billions to two hundred billions in wealth. It is a policy under which agriculture has expanded from six hundred millions to nine billions, mining from one hundred millions to three billions, and manufactures from two billions to thirty billions. It is a policy under which our people have attained to a prosperity, a contentment, a happiness unprecedented in the annals of mankind. It is a policy which has scattered its manifold blessings with undiminished prodigality upon producer and consumer, upon wageworker and capitalist. It is a policy under which this Nation has progressed from the obscurity of a subordinate power to the ascendancy of premierism among the commonwealths of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not incline to observe its assassination without proclaiming its merits, nor to attend its obsequies without delivering its eulogy. I entreat, therefore, the indulgence of the House for a moment while I announce my objections to the pending proposition.

This bill proposes in our relations with Canada to transfer to the free list substantially all the products of the American farm, and I protest against that program as a flagrant discrimination against the homesteads of the Mississippi Valley. We are assured by the report which accompanies this measure that the conditions of all production in the northern Dominion are not materially different from those which obtain in this country. I refuse assent to that doctrine; but if it be true, why has not the reciprocal arrangement herein provided been extended to include manufactures as well? Why has agriculture alone been selected for sacrifice?

True, if our benevolent solicitude embraces the entire Occidental Hemisphere, we may be sustained by the obvious satisfaction which prevails beyond our northern boundary. The Canadian press does not affect to conceal its exultation. I read from the Manitoba Free Press:

The results of the prolonged negotiations between the Canadian and American Governments are now before the people. The scope of the changes which have been agreed to is undoubtedly wider than had been anticipated. While in a matter of so much moment hurried judgments may call for revision, it may be said, we think, that the people of Canada as a whole will be well satisfied with the conclusions which have been reached.

The outstanding feature of the tariff is the complete reciprocity in farm products. This will undoubtedly be popular with the farmers both of the east and of the west. The good times in the eastern Provinces during the life of the Elgin treaty are a matter of tradition, and there is no doubt that the opening of the markets of the great American cities to the products of the eastern farms will be acceptable and profitable to the eastern farmer. In the west free wheat and free access to the Chicago market for his cattle will undoubtedly appeal very strongly to the cultivator of the soil.

The Ontario Advertiser has not been altogether satisfied with us in the past, but after characterizing the treaty as "the Canadian farmers' triumph," it authorizes us to congratulate ourselves that all is now forgiven. It says:

This treaty agreement is a complete reversal of the normal attitude of the United States for nearly half a century. Except during the brief periods of Cleveland's ascendancy, the policy of the country since the Civil War has been one of stiff-necked protectionism, with a particularly forbidding front toward Canada. Probably no persons have been more surprised at the change than the Canadian negotiators. They could scarcely have expected such liberality when they set out for Washington.

But everywhere the farmers of the United States understand that their welfare is threatened by this inequitable agreement, and everywhere they are condemning without reservation the contemplated betrayal of their interests. Last week in Columbus, Ohio, after listening to a most elaborate argument in its favor from the highest possible authority, the Corn Growers' Association unanimously adopted this resolution:

We doubt the wisdom of throwing open unreservedly our ports to Canadian farm products. By so doing the American farmer will be unable to obtain a fair compensation for the time and labor which he invests in his business, and we recommend that no action be taken by our National Government that shall be detrimental to his interest.

Throughout the country, from Pennsylvania to Colorado and from Minnesota to Arkansas, similar demonstrations of disapproval are reported. And why not? The agricultural interest is the most important of any in the industrial community and the most susceptible to injury by a retrograde movement toward free trade. The farmers remember with painful distinctness the dreary period from 1893 to 1897, when, under the blight of a revenue tariff, capital was out of investment, labor out of employment, and everybody out of everything but trouble. They have not forgotten that melancholy epoch when insolvent banks, silent factories, prostrate enterprises, idle workmen, and starving children furnished indisputable evidence that the administration of the Government was under Democratic control. And they are not eager for a repetition of the experience. They have heretofore supposed that they are entitled to consideration in the formulation of tariff schedules. Our last national platform declared:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

I venture to inquire of the bipartisan combination which is responsible for this bill whether in its preparation this test was applied or this rule observed? If so, detailed explanations will be gratefully entertained. The farmers and stock raisers and meat producers of the West will be delighted to be initiated into the mysteries of that system of mathematics which will enable them to continue occupying land worth a hundred dollars an acre and employing labor at \$2 a day in competition with their Canadian neighbors occupying land worth \$45 an acre and employing labor at \$1 a day. If this sagacious committee can advise us by what miracle of financial legerdemain they expect us to overcome this inequality, we shall acknowledge our obligation with appropriate humility.

But it is contended that the departure to which we are invited is a "farsighted policy," that "no yardstick" should be resorted to in measuring its benefits or injuries, and that our party is committed to the principle of reciprocity. I find two declarations upon the subject of reciprocity in recent national platforms, but neither justifies the agreement which we are now considering. In 1900 we said:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the character of reciprocity which was espoused by Blaine, indorsed by McKinley, and to which the Republican party is committed—a reciprocity on "what we do not ourselves produce, which can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry." But the measure we are discussing will not result in establishing profitable reciprocity, it will eventuate in the introduction of absolute free trade. It is enjoying unusual popularity among our Democratic friends because they recognize in its adoption the first step in the complete overthrow of the settled policy of protection as it has been developed for half a century.

Has it occurred to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have fallen upon parlous times when a tariff measure is submitted to a Republican House with the enthusiastic approbation of all the prominent Democrats on the floor? I am a protectionist of the old school. Shall I accept this new leadership when I am convinced that it will involve my country in industrial paralysis and my party in political disaster?

In this controversy I assume to represent some thousands of farmers in the sixth congressional district of Iowa, and I agree that they with their fellows will be the principal sufferers if this legislation is enacted. But I warn the gentlemen from Massachusetts that in imperiling our prosperity they are destroying their own. We have never complained of a reasonable tariff upon what they make when we have been allowed as reasonable a tariff upon what we grow. We recognize that unless

their factories employ labor steadily at remunerative wages the profit of our market is reduced, and we cheerfully concede them duties on what they manufacture, measuring the difference between productive cost at home and abroad. Moreover, we maintain that if the policy of protection is to continue in this country, there must be a consistent mutuality in the advantages which it confers. We do not object to a necessary tariff on what we buy if we are guaranteed a moderate tariff on what we sell. But I serve notice now that the people for whom I speak, people as intelligent, as patriotic, as progressive as any beneath the stars and stripes, will never tolerate duties on everything they consume while denied duties on everything they produce.

I appeal from the provincial sectional selfishness which insists upon discriminating against a single interest to the comprehensive national sentiment which demands the conservation of every interest. [Loud applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 32216) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOOD of New Jersey, for five days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SMITH of Michigan, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. ALLEN, for one week, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MOORE of Texas, for 10 days, on account of important business.

DAM ACROSS ROCK RIVER AT LYNDON, ILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, with Senate amendments, the bill H. R. 30571, an act permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A similar House bill was ordered to be laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT SAUK RAPIDS, MINN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill S. 10757, an act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.

The bill was read in full.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar bill on the House Calendar was ordered laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MOBILE RIVER AT MOBILE, ALA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 10410) to authorize the Pensacola, Mobile & New Orleans Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across the Mobile River and its navigable channels on a line opposite the city of Mobile, Ala.

The bill was read in full.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar bill on the House Calendar was ordered laid upon the table.

INCOME TAX.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the State of Nebraska touching the income-tax amendment, which, without objection, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and Journal without being read:

House roll 55.

A bill for a joint and concurrent resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to taxes on incomes, said amendment having passed both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America with the necessary two-thirds majority.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit: "A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amend-

ment to the Constitution of the United States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely—

"ART. XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Therefore

Be it enacted and resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

SEC. 2. Be it further resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington and to the presiding officers of each House of the National Congress.

Attest:

JOHN KUHLL,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
HENRY C. RICHMOND,
Chief Clerk of House of Representatives.
M. R. HOPWELL,
President of Senate.

Attest:

WM. H. SMITH,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved, 1911.

CHESTER H. ALDRICH, Governor.

STATE OF NEBRASKA, ss:

I, Henry C. Richmond, chief clerk house of representatives, hereby certify that the within bill originated in the house and passed the legislature on the 9th day of February, 1911.

HENRY C. RICHMOND,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

STATE OF NEBRASKA, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Addison Wait, secretary of state of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house roll No. 55, enacted and passed by the thirty-second session of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, with the enrolled bill on file in this office, and that the same is a true and correct copy of said house roll No. 55.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Nebraska.

Done at Lincoln this 11th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1911, of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-fourth, and of this State the forty-third.

[SEAL.]

ADDISON WAIT, Secretary of State.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7648. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 8008. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its existing Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 10015. An act for rebuilding and improving the present light and fog signal at Lincoln Rock, Alaska, or for building another light and fog-signal station upon a different site near by; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10177. An act to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Lighthouse Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10210. An act to direct the construction of a lighthouse and its maintenance near Orford Reef, off Cape Blanco, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10011. An act for establishing a light and fog-signal station on the San Pedro Breakwater, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 865. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6550. An act for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 10257. An act establishing a light and fog-signal station at Portage River Pierhead, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10256. An act establishing a light and fog-signal station on Michigan Island, Lake Superior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10141. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 9970. An act to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 10025. An act for a fog signal and keeper's quarters at the Trinidad Head Light Station, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10023. An act for establishing a light and fog-signal station on Richardsons Rock, in the Santa Barbara Islands, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10022. An act for establishing aids to navigation on the Yukon River, Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10008. An act for a flashing light to replace the fixed light now at the Point Fermin Light Station, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10017. An act for a flashing light, a fog signal, and a keeper's dwelling at the Santa Barbara Light Station, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10010. An act for the substitution of a first-class fog signal to replace the present Daboll trumpet at the Fort Point Light Station, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10012. An act for the establishment of acetylene-gas beacon lights, lighted buoys, and fog signals at or near Point Herron, Point Glover, Apple Cove Point, Bush Point, Point Partridge, and the improvement of the lights and fog signals at Morrowstone Point and Slip Point, Puget Sound, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1882. An act for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 9954. An act for the relief of Lincoln C. Andrews; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6582. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 19, 1906, as amended by act of Congress approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 288. An act for the creation of the police and firemen's relief fund, to provide for the retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 8645. An act to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 9241. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to revive, with amendments, an act to incorporate the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, approved July 7, 1838;" to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 9239. An act to change the name of Fort Place from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE. to Irving Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 6878. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands by the Reclamation Service by exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 9556. An act to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 10189. An act to amend an act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 9123. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection of the United States post-office building at Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 9124. An act to increase the limit of cost for the erection of the United States post-office building at Sistersville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 5036. An act for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 6645. An act for the establishment of a park at the junction of Maryland Avenue, Fifteenth Street, and H Street NE., Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4678. An act to adjust the claims of certain settlers of Sherman County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 8608. An act to authorize the President of the United States to place upon the retired list of the United States Navy Surg. I. W. Kite with the rank of medical inspector; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 9271. An act for the relief of William H. Walsh; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 10208. An act authorizing the resurvey of certain lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 10536. An act directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lot No. 20, square No. 253, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 10275. An act relative to joint operations of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 9011. An act to provide for the granting by the Secretary of the Interior of permits to explore and prospect for oil and gas on unappropriated and withdrawn lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution authorizing the printing of the message of the President, together with the report of the agent of the United States in the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague; to the Committee on Printing.

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution directing that a portion of square No. 857 in the city of Washington, D. C., be reserved for use as an avenue and improved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 21882. An act for the relief of Horace D. Bennett;

H. R. 28214. An act providing for the levy of taxes by the taxing officers of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14729. An act for the relief of Capt. Evan M. Johnson, United States Army;

H. R. 31649. An act to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn.;

H. R. 31648. An act to authorize the county of Hamilton, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn.;

H. R. 30727. An act providing for the sale of certain lands to the city of Buffalo, Wyo.;

H. R. 23827. An act extending the provisions of section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, and acts amendatory thereto, to the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation in Wyoming;

H. R. 25234. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent to certain lands to Charles E. Miller;

H. R. 5968. An act to pay Thomas P. Morgan, jr., amount found due him by Court of Claims;

H. R. 32004. An act providing for the quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 19505. An act for the relief of Eugene Martin;

H. R. 32222. An act authorizing homestead entries on certain lands formerly a part of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 13936. An act for the relief of William P. Drummon;

H. R. 30888. An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad;

H. R. 22688. An act to authorize the extension of Thirteenth Street NW. from its present terminus north of Madison Street to Piney Branch Road;

H. R. 25081. An act for the relief of Helen S. Hogan;

H. R. 29715. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing bridges and approaches thereto across the Waccamaw River, S. C.;

H. R. 24749. An act revising and amending the statutes relative to trade-marks;

H. R. 31927. An act authorizing the town of Blackberry to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Itasca County, Minn.;

H. R. 30793. An act to authorize the Fargo & Moorhead Street Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 17007. An act for the relief of Willard W. Alt;

H. R. 20375. An act to authorize certain changes in the permanent system of highways, District of Columbia;

H. R. 25679. An act for the relief of the Sanitary Water-Still Co.;

H. R. 26529. An act for the relief of Phoebe Clark;

H. R. 19747. An act for the relief of William C. Rich;

H. R. 31661. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to transfer the lighthouse tender *Wistaria* to the Secretary of the Treasury;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of John G. Stauffer & Son;

H. R. 23314. An act to authorize the employment of letter carriers at certain post offices;

H. R. 25074. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Walter B. Chester*;

H. R. 6776. An act for the relief of Oliva J. Baker, widow of Julian G. Baker, late quartermaster, United States Navy;

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of R. A. Sisson;

H. R. 31171. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela

River, in the State of Pennsylvania, by the Liberty Bridge Co.," approved March 2, 1907;

H. R. 30135. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 31161. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 30886. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 30899. An act to authorize the Great Western Land Co. of Missouri to construct a bridge across Black River;

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915, at San Francisco, Cal.;

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution for the relief of Thomas Hoyne.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 7252. An act granting an annuity to John R. Kissinger;

S. 10348. An act to convey to the city of Fort Smith, Ark., a portion of the national cemetery reservation in said city;

S. 9566. An act to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Pocahontas National Forest;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Alfred Childers;

S. 10594. An act to authorize S. G. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison, Kans.;

S. 10595. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution reaffirming the boundary line between Texas and the Territory of New Mexico.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 31859. An act to authorize the Chuawalla Development Co. to build a dam across the Colorado River at or near the mouth of Pyramid Canyon, Ariz.; also a diversion intake dam at or near Black Point, Ariz., and Blythe, Cal.;

H. R. 21646. An act for the relief of William Doherty;

H. R. 31172. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 18342. An act for the relief of E. C. Young;

H. R. 30149. An act to transfer the military reservation known as Fort Trumbull, situated at New London, Conn., from the War Department to the Treasury Department, for the use of the Revenue-Cutter Service;

H. R. 18857. An act for the relief of Laura A. Wagner;

H. R. 29300. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a certain 40-acre tract of land to the Masonic order in Oklahoma;

H. R. 23361. An act authorizing the Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas, to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 1 and 2, in block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 30890. An act to authorize the Chicago Great Western Railroad Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn.;

H. R. 31656. An act extending the time for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by an act approved April 23, 1906, entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Co. to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pa., from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County;" and

H. R. 20072. An act for the relief of Hans N. Anderson.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLETT, from the Committee on Appropriations, presented for printing under the rule the conference report (No. 2158) and statement on the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 28, 29, 39, 40, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 90, 91, 116, 120, 126, 142, 143, 144, 150, 151, 155, 156, 157, 158, 163, 168, 175, 183, 185, 189, 204, 208, 217, and 222.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 187, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 206, 207, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228, 229, and 230, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment, after the word "available," strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$174,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "2 clerks, at \$2,000 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "forty-two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$332,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$147,970"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$278,410"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "boxes," strike out the words "five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two thousand five hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,311,010"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$171,190"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 210: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 210, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36,510"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On amendments numbered 30, 31, 32, 33, 41, 42, 44, 45, 85, 86, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, and 218 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

F. H. GILLETT,
J. V. GRAFF,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
E. J. BURKETT,
MURPHY J. FOSTER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 29360) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1912, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report, as to each of the amendments of the Senate, namely: Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, relating to salaries of officers and employees and other expenses of the Senate, are all recommended to be agreed to by the House.

On amendments Nos. 28 and 29: Strikes out the proposed increase of an assistant clerk to a House committee.

On amendment No. 34: Makes the appropriation for fuel and oil, under the House of Representatives, available for the Capitol power plant.

On amendments Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40, relating to the Library of Congress: Increases the salary of the Librarian from \$6,000 to \$6,500; provides for two additional assistants at \$600 each in the reading room; and strikes out the provision for a stenographer and typewriter at \$900 in the law library.

On amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$18,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$17,000, as proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses of the Library of Congress.

On amendment No. 46: Provides that the reorganization of the force in the Executive Office shall take effect immediately on the passage of the act.

On amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$3,000, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expert examiners for the Civil Service Commission.

On amendments Nos. 48, 49, and 50: Appropriates \$12,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the House, for the salary of the Secretary of State; and increases the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Trade Relations in the State Department from \$2,100 to \$2,500.

On amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, and 64, relating to the divisions of the office of the Secretary of the Treasury: Increases the salary of the chief clerk of the department from \$3,000 to \$4,000; provides for five firemen at \$600, instead of \$720 each, as proposed by the Senate; increases the pay of five law clerks in the Division of Customs from \$2,000 to \$2,500 each; strikes out the increases, proposed by the Senate, in salaries in the Division of Appointments; and provides for a bookbinder at \$1,250 in the Division of Printing and Stationery.

On amendments Nos. 65, 66, and 67: Strikes out the increase in salary of five inspectors, proposed by the Senate, in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

On amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Increases the salary of the Comptroller of the Treasury from \$5,500 to \$6,000.

On amendment No. 70: Transfers to the assistant and chief clerk in the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department the duties and powers heretofore exercised by the deputy auditor.

On amendments Nos. 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75, relating to the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department, increases salaries as follows: Of the auditor, from \$4,000 to \$5,000; the law clerk, from \$2,500 to \$3,000; the expert accountant, from \$2,250 to \$2,750; and of four chiefs of division, from \$2,000 to \$2,250 each.

On amendments Nos. 75, 77, 78, and 79, relating to the office of the Treasurer: Reduces the number of clerks at \$900 each

from 27 to 26, and the number of counters at \$700 each from 20 to 19.

On amendments Nos. 80, 81, and 82, relating to the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue: Provides for two clerks at \$2,000 each instead of two clerks at \$900 each.

On amendments Nos. 83 and 84: Provides for a messenger at \$840, instead of an assistant messenger at \$720, in the office of the Life-Saving Service.

On amendments Nos. 87, 88, 89, and 90, relating to the office of the Director of the Mint: Increases the salary of the director from \$4,500 to \$5,000, and of the adjuster of accounts from \$2,250 to \$2,500, and appropriates \$200, as proposed by the House, instead of \$400, as proposed by the Senate, for books and pamphlets.

On amendment No. 91: Strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate making the appropriation of \$75,000 for investigation of accounts and records and to secure better methods of administration in the Treasury Department, available for unforeseen contingencies.

On amendments Nos. 92, 93, and 94, relating to the subtreasury at Boston, Mass.: Increases the pay of an assistant receiving teller from \$1,600 to \$1,700, and of a redemption clerk from \$1,400 to \$1,600.

On amendments Nos. 95, 96, 97, and 98, relating to the mint at New Orleans, La.: Appropriates for two additional clerks at \$1,200 each and increases the amount for wages of workmen from \$6,540 to \$7,500.

On amendments Nos. 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, and 115, relating to the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico: Increases the salaries of the governors from \$3,000 to \$3,500 each, and of the secretaries from \$1,800 to \$2,500 each.

On amendments Nos. 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, relating to the office of the Secretary of War: Increases the salary of the disbursing clerk from \$2,500 to \$2,750; of the appointment clerk from \$2,000 to \$2,250; the additional compensation of the superintendent of buildings from \$250 to \$500; and one elevator conductor from \$470 to \$540; strikes out the proposed increase in the salary of the clerk to the assistant and chief clerk from \$2,100 to \$2,250, and of two messenger boys from \$360 each to \$600 each.

On amendments Nos. 123 and 124: Increases the salary of the chief clerk and solicitor in the office of the Judge Advocate General of the War Department from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

On amendments Nos. 125, 126, 127, and 128, relating to the office of the Quartermaster General: Increases the salary of one supervising engineer from \$2,500 to \$2,750; strikes out the increase proposed in the salary of the sanitary and heating engineer from \$1,800 to \$2,000; and provides for a writer of specifications and computer at \$1,200.

On amendments Nos. 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, and 135, relating to the office of the Commissary General: Provides for two additional clerks, \$1,800 each; one additional clerk, at \$1,600; two additional clerks, at \$1,400 each; makes a reduction of two clerks, at \$1,200 each; two clerks, at \$1,000 each; and one clerk, at \$900.

On amendments Nos. 136 and 137: Increases the amount for services of skilled draftsmen and others in the office of the Chief of Ordnance, in the War Department, from \$45,000 to \$50,000, and makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill.

On amendments Nos. 138, 139, 140, and 141, relating to the office of Public Buildings and Grounds: Provides for a superintendent at \$3,000 instead of an engineer at \$2,400; and appropriates \$2,800 for uniforms for park watchmen.

On amendment No. 142: Strikes out the proposed appropriation of \$5,000 for repair of floors of corridors in the State, War, and Navy Department Building.

On amendments Nos. 143 and 144: Strikes out the proposed increase in salary of the telegraph operator from \$1,100 to \$1,200 in the office of the Secretary of the Navy.

On amendments Nos. 145, 146, and 147: Provides for a clerk at \$1,200 instead of a copyist at \$900 in the Office of Naval Records of the Rebellion.

On amendments Nos. 148 and 149: Provides for an additional copyist at \$840 in the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department.

On amendments Nos. 150 and 151: Strikes out the provision for an additional laborer at \$660 in the Office of Naval Intelligence.

On amendment No. 152: Appropriates \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a monthly pilot chart of the North Pacific Ocean.

On amendments Nos. 153 and 154: Increases the pay of one assistant from \$1,800 to \$2,000 in the Nautical Almanac Office.

On amendments Nos. 155 and 156: Strikes out the provision for an additional clerk at \$1,800 in the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department.

On amendments Nos. 157 and 158: Strikes out provision for an additional clerk, at \$1,800, in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department.

On amendment No. 159: Appropriates \$2,500 instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for steel file cases and file boxes for the Navy Department.

On amendments Nos. 160, 161, and 162: Increases the salary of the chief clerk of the Interior Department from \$3,000 to \$4,000.

On amendment No. 163: Strikes out the proposed increase from \$3 to \$4 for the per diem allowance of two special inspectors in the Interior Department.

On amendments Nos. 164, 165, and 166: Provides for an assistant chief of division at \$2,000 instead of a clerk at \$1,800 in the General Land Office.

On amendments Nos. 167, 168, and 169: Increases the salary of the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs from \$3,000 to \$3,500, and strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, authorizing his appointment to be made by the Secretary of the Interior.

On amendments Nos. 170, 171, 172, 173, and 174, relating to the Pension Office: Provides for a second Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, at \$3,600, and rearranges the provision for skilled laborers without increasing their number or compensation.

On amendments Nos. 175, 176, 177, and 178, relating to the Patent Office: Strikes out the provision for an assistant examiner of trade-marks and designs, at \$2,400; provides for six assistant examiners of trade-marks and designs, at \$1,500 each; and appropriates \$500, instead of \$250, for investigating the question of public use or sale of inventions.

On amendments Nos. 179 and 180, relating to the Bureau of Education: Provides for a specialist in higher education at \$3,000, and reduces the amount from \$9,000 to \$6,000 for the investigation of rural education, industrial education, and school hygiene.

On amendments Nos. 181 and 182: Increases the salary of the chief electrical engineer of the Capitol and other buildings from \$2,400 to \$3,000.

On amendment No. 183: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, for the installation of a laundry plant in the Interior Department.

On amendments Nos. 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, and 189, relating to the Post Office Department: Increases the salary of the chief clerk of the department from \$3,000 to \$4,000; strikes out the provision for a painter at \$900; increases the salary of the assistant superintendent of the Division of Supplies from \$1,800 to \$2,000; and strikes out the provision for the "purchase of vehicles" instead of the "purchase of wagons."

On amendments Nos. 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, and 199, relating to the Department of Justice: Increases salaries as follows: Attorney in charge of titles from \$2,700 to \$3,500; chief clerk of the department from \$2,500 to \$3,000; superintendent of prisons from \$3,000 to \$4,000; chief of division of investigation from \$3,000 to \$3,500; librarian from \$1,600 to \$1,800; the assistant solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor from \$2,250 to \$3,000; and provides for a messenger at \$960 instead of one at \$840.

On amendments Nos. 204, 206, and 207: Makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill and increases the salary of an assistant engineer in the Bureau of Lighthouses from \$2,100 to \$2,250.

On amendments Nos. 208, 209, 210, 211, and 212, relating to the Bureau of Statistics: Strikes out the proposed increase in the salary of the chief clerk from \$2,250 to \$2,500 and provides for three additional clerks, one at \$1,600, one at \$1,400, and one at \$1,200.

On amendments Nos. 213 and 214: Increases the salary of the assistant chief of Division of Naturalization from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

On amendments Nos. 215, 216, and 217: Increases the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Standards from \$5,000 to \$6,000 and restores to the bill the provision authorizing the designation of some officer of the Bureau of Standards to act during the absence of the director.

On amendments Nos. 219 and 220: Increases the salaries of nine stenographic clerks to the Justices of the Supreme Court from \$1,600 to \$2,000 each.

On amendments Nos. 221, 222, 223, 224, and 225, relating to the court of appeals, District of Columbia: Increases the salary of the clerk from \$3,250 to \$3,500; strikes out the proposed increase in the salary of the crier from \$1,000 to \$1,200; appropriates \$1,000 instead of \$800 for necessary expenditures in the conduct of the clerk's office, and increases the salaries of the three stenographers for the judges of the court from \$900 to \$1,200 each.

On amendment No. 226: Provides for a stenographer at \$720 for the district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

On amendments Nos. 227 and 228, relating to the Commerce Court: Makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill, and appropriates \$75,000 for payment of bailiffs and other employees not otherwise specifically provided for, and for such other miscellaneous expenses as may be approved by the presiding judge, instead of a sum of money for requisite assistance.

On amendments Nos. 229 and 230: Appropriates for an additional laborer, at \$660, for the Court of Claims.

The committee of conference has been unable to agree on the following amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, 32, and 33, relating to the salaries of stenographers of the House.

On amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriating \$100,000, instead of \$75,000, for increase of the Library of Congress.

On amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Increasing the salary of the Secretary to the President from \$6,000 to \$10,000.

On amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Increasing the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing from \$5,500 to \$6,000.

On amendments Nos. 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, and 109, relating to the assay offices at Charlotte, N. C., Helena Mont., New York, N. Y., and Salt Lake City, Utah.

On amendments Nos. 200 and 201: Providing for an additional assistant secretary of Commerce and Labor.

On amendments Nos. 202 and 203: Appropriating \$60,000, instead of \$40,000, for commercial agents for the Department of Commerce and Labor.

On amendment No. 205: Appropriating \$10,000, instead of \$8,000, to enable the Bureau of Manufactures to collate and publish tariffs of foreign countries; and

On amendment No. 218: Striking out the appropriation of \$25,000 to complete the testing machine at Pittsburg.

FREDK. H. GILLET,
JOSEPH V. GRAFF,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to print upon the bill H. R. 32216, the reciprocity bill, for five legislative days.

Mr. FASSETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what the disposition is in reference to allowing time for debate on the floor.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request. I offered it in entire agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. FASSETT. Then, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that Members of the House may have leave to print on the bill H. R. 32216, the reciprocity bill, for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. OLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am forced to object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a statement of documents received and distributed by that department (H. Doc. No. 1383) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PRAY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 8457) to restore to the public domain certain lands withdrawn for reservoir purposes in Millard County, Utah, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2156), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5432) to authorize

the city of Seattle, Wash., to purchase certain lands for the protection of the source of its water supply, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2159), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31806), to amend an act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed on a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation," approved April 20, 1904, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2154), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 32724) to amend the charter of the Firemen's Insurance Co. of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2157), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. COWLES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8535) for the relief of George T. Larkin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2155), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII,

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 937) of inquiry relative to paint shipped to Panama, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2153), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 32751) to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW., through parcel 8613; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: A bill (H. R. 32752) to amend section 4488, Revised Statutes, for the greater safety and protection of passengers on steam vessels of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 32753) to authorize expenditures for aids to navigation in the Delaware River and Bay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 32754) authorizing the reconveyance to the United States, by States and Territories, of lands, occupied, used, or needed in carrying out the reclamation law or the Carey Act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 32755) providing for the issuance of a charter to the Veteran Reserve Corps of America, a corporate military organization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 32756) to authorize the Greeley-Arizona Irrigation Co. to build a dam across the Colorado River at or near Head Gate Rock, near Parker, in Yuma County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 32757) placing articles imported into the United States for use in the construction and equipment of pulp and paper mills and in the manufacture of the products thereof on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 968) authorizing the appointment of an additional clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 969) of inquiry as to certain facts relating to the merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 970) inquiring of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor as to certain facts relating to the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 971) authorizing payment of \$1,200 to Herman Gauss for services as assistant clerk to Committee on Invalid Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. McCALL: Resolution (H. Res. 972) providing for the consideration of House bill 32216; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Washington, concerning coal and other lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Montana, relative to election of United States Senators by popular vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, asking the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact the measure now pending relating to United States pension agencies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: Memorial of the Legislature of Montana, for donation of unappropriated public lands to aid in establishment of hospital for treatment of indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Montana, relative to election of United States Senators by popular vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Montana, petitioning Congress to set aside unappropriated public lands in aid of asylum for insane; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, asking the Congress of the United States not to enact the measure now pending to consolidate the pension agencies which now exist into one in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, favoring an amendment to the Constitution, providing for the direct election of Senators; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, favoring the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 32758) granting a pension to Gus M. Brass, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32759) granting a pension to Anna Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 32760) granting an increase of pension to William T. Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 32761) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Elton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32762) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Waltshlager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32763) granting an increase of pension to William T. Colbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 32764) granting an increase of pension to Elihu W. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 32765) granting an increase of pension to Annie G. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 32766) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Pinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 32767) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MASSEY: A bill (H. R. 32768) granting an increase of pension to Henry Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32769) for the relief of Passed Asst. Paymaster Edwin M. Hacker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 32770) granting a pension to Frank Sutterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 32771) granting a pension to Mary Rooney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: A bill (H. R. 32772) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Vogel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 32773) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 32774) granting an increase of pension to John H. Nutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, praying that the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation be ceded to Whitman College; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying that the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation be ceded to Whitman College; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. W. Styles, of Momence, Ill., and five others, and H. McAlester and one other, protesting against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Pontiac Farmers' Grain Co., of Pontiac, Ill.; Congress of the Knights of Labor; and National Grange, protesting against the trade agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 1, of Washington, D. C., praying for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the construction of a public building at Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Purchase Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, of Westchester County, N. Y., protesting against the fortification of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of Society of the Colonial Dames of America, in the States of Texas and Missouri, and of the governor general of the Order of the Descendants of Colonial Governors, protesting against the establishment or location of a reformatory in the vicinity of Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of F. C. Beeman and other citizens of Osceola County, Mich., praying for the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Phoenix (Ariz.) Board of Trade, asking for an appropriation for the restriction of the spread of alfalfa-leaf weevil; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of Camp 2, Patriotic Order Sons of America, for restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of George V. Stabell and other citizens of Lancaster, N. Y., favoring the building of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of West Side Business Men and Taxpayers' Association, of Buffalo, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Petition of citizens of New York State, for construction of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Washington Camp No. 22, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Yonkers, N. Y., for H. R. 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of members of the Society of Friends, for neutralization of the canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of Tarrytown Typographical Union, No. 523, for the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of business firms of Delphos, Ohio, against a rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Franklin County Bar Association, of Ohio, against holding of Federal district courts in the city of Portsmouth, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of the United States, at Cincinnati, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. R. Woodling, of Beach City, Ohio, for a parcels post and against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Ohio State Grange, favoring the parcels post, the election of United States Senators by a

direct vote of the people, a nonpartisan tariff commission, and liberal appropriations by State and National Governments for the building of permanent highways, and in opposition to the change of rural mail delivery to the star-route system, and also to any change in the present oleomargarine law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petitions of Washingtonville Grange, No. 912, of Blooming Grove, and Goshen Grange, No. 915, of Goshen, all of Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Washington Camp No. 150, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Valley Forge, Pa., for enactment of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Federation of Labor of Chester, Pa., for H. R. 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Republican Club of New York, favoring the Depew amendment to Senate joint resolution 134; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union, favoring illiteracy test in the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, for repeal of 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Verbeck, adjutant general of New York State, for bill providing for 612 additional officers in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Catholic Woman's Club, of Kenosha, Wis., for a children's bureau; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., for construction of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Muscatine (Iowa) Trades and Labor Assembly, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Local No. 13, Troy Musical Association, for repeal of 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of Assembly of New York State, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David Secrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of New York Medical Journal, against proposed increase of postal rates on certain magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of New York State Assembly, for building battleship *New York* in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Merchants' Association of New York and New York Produce Exchange, for reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, for battleship building in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Los Angeles County Osteopathic Society, against a Federal department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, against increase of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. R. Cooke, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring a dental corps for the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of E. R. Elliott and others, of Rockford, Ill., against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for pensions of \$30 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Illinois State Branch of the National German-American Alliance, for House bill 9137, for a monument at Germantown, Pa., to mark the first German settlement in America; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of fifteenth congressional district of Texas, protesting against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of citizens of New York, against increase of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. R. Cook, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring a dental corps for the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of Pittsburg, Pa., against repeal of act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. L., chap. 546, p. 605), relative to hand printing of United States notes, bonds, and checks; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of people on rural routes of North Dakota, for increase of salaries of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of the county of Pembina, State of North Dakota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of citizens of South Bosque, Tex., against passage of a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of citizens of Paducah, Ky., for reduction of oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Williamstown, Ky., for restricted immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Des Moines and Muscatine, Iowa, for neutralization of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: Petitions of Wabash Council, No. 73, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Baltimore City; the State Council, Daughters of America; Washington Camps Nos. 67 and 82, Patriotic Order Sons of America, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petitions of Rock Council, No. 54, and Colonial Council, No. 605, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Glen Rock, Pa., for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring construction of battleship *New York* at a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Loren Township Civic League, 78 voters, for the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of citizens of Falls City and business men of Virginia, Du Bois, Table Rock, Lewiston, Dawson, and Salem, all in the State of Nebraska, against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Washington Camps Nos. 461, 419, 608, 7, and 101, all of Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging the enactment of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also petition of Local No. 1731, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Daniel Webster Council, No. 700; Kenderton Council, No. 221; Port Matilda Council, No. 921; Spring City Council, No. 900; Johnstown Council, No. 700; Smoky City Council, No. 119; Markleysburg Council, No. 568; and Sherwood Council, No. 160, all of Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Washington Camp No. 147, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging passage of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Hair Spinners' Union No. 72347, of Philadelphia; Mr. A. C. Nowland, J. C. Dounton, Charles Wallace & Co., all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of amendment to agricultural appropriation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of Washington Camps Nos. 752, 727, and 117, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and of Sherwood Council, No. 160, and Susquehanna Council, No. 89, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of citizens of Helena, Mont., in favor of the Carter-Weeks bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of Kansas, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Kansas, against Senate bill 404, Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of Town Council of Warren, R. I.; P. P. Stewart Hale and 15 other citizens of Newport, R. I.; and George W. Leonard and 20 others, of Newport, R. I., favoring Senate bill 5677, promoting efficiency of Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Hugh R. Miller and 7 others, Edward M. Chase and 28 others, John Degraw and 10 others, F. H. Bennett and 15 others, William Maberg and 52 others, James M. Brady and 12 others, Warren Evans and 8 others, East Casco Grange and 144 others, Frank La Chapelle and 36 others, William Arnold and 17 others, S. E. Martin and 17 others, all residents of the sixth Michigan congressional district, for a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Memorial of Metal Trades Council of Hartford and Central Labor Union of Hartford, favoring construction of battleship *New York* at Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Unity Grange, of Chester, Conn., against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Lumber Dealers' Association of Connecticut, favoring the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of New York State Pharmaceutical Association, for defeat of House bill 25241; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Western Star Council, Sidney, Ohio; Ruby Council, Bradford, Ohio; and General Meade Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNG of New York: Petition of John J. Young and other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the construction of the battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 14, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 30571) permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

- S. 7252. An act granting an annuity to John R. Kissinger;
- H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of John G. Stauffer & Son;
- H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of R. A. Sisson;
- H. R. 6776. An act for the relief of Oliva J. Baker, widow of Julian G. Baker, late quartermaster, United States Navy;
- H. R. 17007. An act for the relief of Willard W. Alt;
- H. R. 19747. An act for the relief of William C. Rich;
- H. R. 20375. An act to authorize certain changes in the permanent system of highways, District of Columbia;
- H. R. 22688. An act to authorize the extension of Thirteenth Street NW. from its present terminus of Madison Street to Piney Branch Road;
- H. R. 23314. An act to authorize the employment of letter carriers at certain post offices;
- H. R. 24749. An act revising and amending the statutes relative to trade-marks;
- H. R. 25074. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Walter B. Chester*;
- H. R. 25081. An act for the relief of Helen S. Hogan;